21 MAY 1981

Lebanese Crisis

Al-Asad Interview--Damascus radio broadcast an announcer-read account of President Hafiz al-Asad's interview with U.S. newsmen in which he said U.S. Special Envoy Philip Habib has been conveying Israeli demands to Syria rather than putting forth U.S. proposals. Al-Asad said a specific plan, as mentioned in some media circles, has not been proposed to Syria, and he asserted that the Lebanese Government alone has the right to discuss and decide what is permissible in Lebanese territory and airspace. Asked about any Syrian conditions for a withdrawal of the SAM missiles from Lebanon, Al-Asad said the question of the missiles is a matter not of conditions but of necessity. Syria had only installed the missiles in Lebanon for defensive purposes after the Israeli Air Force attack on Syrian helicopters and ground forces on a day when there was no fighting in Lebanon and when Syria had begun negotiations to achieve accord there. The missiles do not strike targets in Israel, he noted, but only hit planes seeking to attack Syrian forces. He claimed that Israel's actions show that it wants to prevent accord in Lebanon and desires to impose hegemony over Lebanon, subjugate Syria and violate Lebanese airspace unchecked, striking at the Lebanese, Palestinians and Syrians whenever it wants. The Syrian leader accused successive U.S. administrations of supplying Israel with the best technology in the world to give it superiority over all the Arabs. Israel's unprecedented arrogance, haughtiness and aggression would have been impossible without U.S. support, he went on, and the United States can and should curb Israel.

Regarding Arab financial aid to the Arab Deterrent Forces (ADF) in Lebanon, Al-Asad said it is unimportant and immaterial to Syria whether the other Arab states continue their aid. The Arab financial assistance to the ADF is more token aid than real aid, he said, since Syria bears 90 percent of the ADF's supply costs, with the other Arabs supplying only about $10 million. He expressed confidence that if Syria is in need its Arab brothers will resume their aid. In any case, he added, Saudi Arabia has informed Syria that it has not stopped financing the ADF, and Kuwait has withdrawn its reservations about the force. Syria has not been officially notified of any cessation of this Arab aid, he said. Al-Asad concluded his remarks by reaffirming that Syria has no plans to attack Israel, but that if Israel should attack the Syrians, "we will strongly defend ourselves." There will be no war unless Israel attacks, he indicated, but he urged U.S. public opinion to recognize that Israel's behavior has been contrary to all rules, logic and international norms.

Habib Mission--Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin met with U.S. Special Envoy Habib, IDF radio reported, for another round of talks on the crisis over Syria's missiles in Lebanon. In remarks after the meeting, broadcast by the radio, Begin said his talks with Habib were important and good, but he added that he could not say whether they will yield positive results in view of Syrian President al-Asad's "extreme" statements earlier in the day. Begin described as untrue Al-Asad's assertion that Habib had conveyed Israeli demands, not U.S. proposals to Damascus, saying that the U.S. envoy had indeed brought U.S. proposals to Syria. Begin said Al-Asad's statement "cannot make us optimistic that a peaceful solution is imminent," though he noted that the Syrian leader's frequent silence during his talks with Habib could be either a good or a bad sign. The Israeli prime minister went on to promise that he will make a further statement after a 24 May Cabinet session and said Israel will continue with diplomatic efforts if there is any hope that they will lead to a peaceful solution. Although he did not retract his recent "very sharp statement" about Saudi Arabia, Begin said the Saudis have been trying to help during the past 24 hours.

According to a Jerusalem radio report on Begin's remarks to journalists after his meeting with Habib, Begin again denied that the United States has asked Israel to restrict its flights over Lebanon and indicated that Israel does not intend to attack Syrian forces. He disclosed that in one incident Israel units had accidently attacked the Syrians, whereupon Israel had indirectly informed them that the attack was unintentional. Jerusalem

radio also reported that before his meeting with Habib, Begin told Knesset members that Syria has softened its position in the Lebanese crisis following the recent talks in Damascus between Habib and Al-Asad.

Military Situation--According to Beirut radio, the capital was relatively calm, although Voice of Lebanon radio reported intermittent shelling and machinegun fire. The Voice of Lebanon also reported Syrian shelling and intensive sniper fire throughout the night in the Phalangist-held city of Zahlah. Beirut radio reported Israeli artillery shelling of An-Nabatiyah in southern Lebanon this morning and said an Israeli commando force infiltrated Bra'shit, kidnapping two citizens. The clandestine Voice of Palestine radio said the Israelis have massed reinforcements in the Golan Heights region. According to Jerusalem radio, border strip Christian militia destroyed a bridge over the Litani River.

Kuwaiti Support—SANA reported that Kuwaiti Defense Minister Salim Sabah as-Salim as-Sabah has asserted that the Kuwaiti Army will fight alongside Syria in the event of WAR between Syria and Israel.

Arab League Summit Delegations--Damascus radio reported that Syrian Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam will attend the emergency session of the Arab League Council, scheduled for tomorrow in Tunis. According to Beirut radio, the Lebanese Cabinet met and selected Foreign Minister Fu'ad Butrus to head the Lebanese delegation. The Voice of Palestine reported that the PLO Executive Committee selected its Political Department chief, Faruq Qaddum, to head the PLO delegation to the Tunis conference.

Saudi Arabia

Fahd Interview--In an interview with SPA, Saudi Crown Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz said the kingdom's intention to purchase AWACS aircraft and sophisticated equipment for the F-15 from the United States falls within its plan for building a modern Saudi Army and expressed surprise that Israel's "crooked logic" regarding a Saudi threat to its security receives such play in the U.S. press. Questioned on the Lebanese situation, Fahd expressed the opinion that at present the Arab nation lacks even the lowest level of solidarity achieved at the 1978 Baghdad summit. The Arabs must put their house in order and adopt practical measures to halt Israeli aggression, he cautioned, adding that the matter requires a universal pan-Arab confrontation. Fahd asserted that if Israel were to attack Syria, all the Arabs would fight alongside Syria. Fahd assessed Saudi-U.S. relations as cordial and good, and found encouragement in the attitude of the Reagan administration toward aircraft purchases. He said that Lebanon's recovery will only be effected through the consolidation of the efforts of the Lebanese and Syrian governments to achieve national reconciliation among the warring parties. Questioned on his reaction to the recent verbal attack by Israeli Prime Minister Begin, Fahd responded that Begin's criticism of the Saudi role in the Lebanese situation indicates that such a role exists and that the Saudi stance is effective and sound.

Yamani on OPEC Conference—In remarks at a Bonn news conference, reported by DPA, Saudi Minister of Petroleum and Mineral Affairs Shaykh Ahmad Zaki Yamani said that at the forthcoming OPEC conference in Geneva Saudi Arabia will advocate the freezing of oil prices at the present level through 1982 and that if no price policy can be agreed upon it will maintain its present prices. He also affirmed that Saudi Arabia will not reduce its current output.

FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East and Africa

Vol V No 098 *21 May 1981*

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW 1

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

'Arafat Meets With Al-Asad in Damascus 20 May A 1
Foreign Ministers Meeting To Review 'One Cause' [VOP] A 1
VOP Says Habib Not Dealing With Crux of Issue A 2

OPEC AFFAIRS

Saudi Minister States Position for Geneva Meeting B 1
AFP Report B 1
UAE Minister Calls for Decreased Oil Production B 1

ARABIAN PENINSULA

KUWAIT

Minister Says Army 'Will Fight' With Syria C 1

SAUDI ARABIA

Crown Prince Fahd Interviewed on Mideast Peace C 1
Minister Sees Progress in Cooperation With U.S. ['UKAZ 17 May] C 4

EGYPT

'Ali Meets With Sterner, Makes Statement D 1
'Ali on Lebanon, Sinai Force, Autonomy Talks D 2
Defense Minister on 5-Year Armament Plan [AL-AHRAM 17 May] D 2
As-Sadat Corrective Revolution Anniversary Address D 3

IRAQ

Armed Forces General Command Communique 342 E 1
President Supports South African Sanctions E 1
Communique Issued on Ugandan Official's Visit E 2

JORDAN

King Husayn To Visit Soviet Union in Late May [TASS] F 1
King Husayn Returns From Seven-Nation Tour F 1
Al-Qasim Discusses War, Arms, Syrian Relations F 1

LEBANON

Sarkis, Sham'un Discuss Habib Mission, Tunis Parley G 1
Internal Security Council Meets Under Al-Hazzan G 1
Cabinet Meets 20 May, Discusses Effects of Shelling G 2
Alleged Cabinet Division Denied G 2
VOL Says ADF Withdraws From Beirut Positions G 2

SYRIA

Al-Asad Says Syria in 'Defensive Position' H 1
Damascus Claims Victory in Present Crisis H 5
Lebanese Crisis Said To Revive Pan-Arab Feeling H 6
TISHRIN Sees Unity as Arab Conference Goal H 6
People's Assembly Speaker Meets Soviet Ambassador H 7
Romanian Justice Minister Arrives 19 May H 7

ISRAEL

Jerusalem: Syria's Position 'Softening' I 1
Begin Gives Press Conference After Habib Talks I 1
More on Begin Remarks I 2
Peres Meets With Habib; Briefed By Begin I 3
Shamir, Eban, Dayan Discuss Debate, Lebanon I 3
Tzipori Briefs Knesset Committee on PLO Position I 4
[MA'ARIV 20 May]

INTER-AFRICAN AFFAIRS

Conference on South Africa Convenes in Paris P 1
Nigerian Leader's Departure P 1
Liberian Minister's Departure P 1
Mandatory Sanctions Issue P 1

EAST AFRICA

DJIBOUTI

USSR Civil Aviation Delegation Arrives 17 May R 1

KENYA

University Students Clash With Riot Police R 1

TANZANIA

Statement Issued on Indonesian Minister's Visit R 1

CENTRAL AFRICA

CHAD

Kamougue Criticizes Libyan Subversion in Chad S 1
Four Frolinat Factions Merge in National Council S 1

WEST AFRICA

IVORY COAST

Algerian Foreign Minister Meets With President T 1

NIGERIA

Lagos Announces Shagari To Go to Ndjamena 21 May T 1
Officials, Press React to Incident With Cameroon T 1
Support for Military Action T 1
No Cameroon Statement Yet T 2
Caution Advised T 2
NEW NIGERIAN Reports 20 Deaths in Borno Clashes T 3

SIERRA LEONE

Stevens Leaves To Attend Ndjamena Summit T 3

TOGO

Lome Announces Reorganization of Cabinet T 3

SOUTHERN AFRICA

ANGOLA

Decree Establishes National Iron Company U 1

SOUTH AFRICA

Response to U.S. Initiative on Namibia Conveyed U 1

ZIMBABWE

Freedom Fighters Integrated Into National Army U 1

'ARAFAT MEETS WITH AL-ASAD IN DAMASCUS 20 MAY

NC201331 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1245 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Brother and Commander Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] met at noon today with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad in Damascus. The meeting was attended by Palestine National Council Chairman Brother Khalid al-Fahum, PLO Executive Committee member Brother 'Abd al-Muhsin Abu Mayzar, Fatah Central Committee members Brothers Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf] and Abu Mahir [Muhammad Ghunaym].

The discussions dealt with the current developments in the Arab area in general in light of the Zionist escalation and military threats against the Palestinian revolution, Syria and the Lebanese National Movement and the isolationist attacks, which are backed by U.S. imperialism and Zionism.

The discussions also dealt with the emergency meeting of the Arab foreign ministers and the necessity of adopting an urgent and firm Arab stand to confront the situation.

FOREIGN MINISTERS MEETING TO REVIEW 'ONE CAUSE'

JN202059 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1800 GMT 20 May 81

[Station commentary: "The Arab Foreign Ministers Once Again Before the One Cause and Not Before Its Artificial Alternatives"]

[Excerpts] The Arab foreign ministers are getting ready to hold a meeting in Tunis to discuss the volatile situation in the Middle East, which U.S. circles prefer to call the crisis of Lebanon or the crisis of missiles and, sometimes, by other titles of transient informational glitter to which studied U.S.-Israeli functions are given.

When the various U.S. organs try to confine the Arab interest to a narrow circle and distract the Arabs' attention from their real cause, turning this attention to partial causes under various titles, and try at the same time to create faits accomplis, they do so in harmony with a traditional trend which has characterized the essence and method of the U.S. moves in our region since the United States assumed the vanguardism of the new imperialist movement, which it inherited from old colonialism. This trend, is based on a firm principle which says that the best way to confiscate the one Arab cause--which is that of Palestine--lies in creating several causes in several areas of the Arab world in order to drown the Arabs in fatal whirlpools that suck up most of their potentials and keep them fully detached from the root of their causes, namely, the issue of Palestine and the Arab-Zionist conflict, which grew and extended from the heart of Palestine.

Now that our 23 foreign ministers are getting ready for a new round of confrontation of the volatile situation in the Middle East, they find themselves--and perhaps for the thousandth time--face to face with an issue that is now 33 years and a few days of age. They also find themselves face to face with a traditional U.S. trend that seeks to divert the attention of the Arabs from their central issue to fabricated ones. Is it not time to block the road before this U.S. trend, which has so far produced large fires in our nation's body? Is it not time that the first Arab cause of Palestine gets truly consecrated in practice through a unified Arab strategy that places all its political, economic and military impact behind the first fighting vanguard, as represented in the Palestinian people's revolution inside and outside the occupied territory and in Arab Syria and the Lebanese nationalist forces that are struggling with the revolution in the first fighting trench in defense of the Arab nation and against the enemy Zionists, imperialists and agents?

Yes, it is time now to do so after our region has been filled with U.S. red lines which are intended to be spread to the depth of the Arab human being wherever he might exist as well as to interact with Palestinian Arab blood which was made open for public shedding by the U.S. administration through its explicit collusion with its Israeli military tool in the region. This military tool's (?insolence) has exceeded the limits of declaring and exercising the war of annihilation against the Palestinian and Lebanese people, taking it to the heart and limbs of the Arab nation.

Yes, it is high time because the matter now concerns the destiny of a nation that must have its decent position in this world and in this era. This nation will not reach its real status except through the gate of Palestine.

VOP SAYS HABIB NOT DEALING WITH CRUX OF ISSUE

JN201942 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1636 GMT 20 May 81

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Just as a sick man is seized by successive fits of fever and his temperature rises in 1 minute and abates in the next, so is public opinion being seized by fits of optimism and pessimism on Philip Habib's mission. Thus, while people are relaxed and relieved for some hours, the atmosphere quickly changes and an explosive atmosphere prevails. This has been going on for more than 1 month.

The cause of such fits is the propaganda being disseminated daily among the people. Of course, the source of such propaganda is the U.S. media and Western mass media in general, which are professionals in the art of creating uproars, distortions and confusion. However, reality as we understand it and as it actually exists completely differs from the reality depicted to public opinion. In truth, the problem neither lies in the success or failure of Habib's mission nor in Begin's smiling or scowling face nor in Sannin, Zahlah or Beirut. Rather, the problem goes much deeper and is much greater than that. It is the problem of Arab confrontation of the Zionist enemy, which is completely supported by the United States. In other words, it is the problem of the Arab-Zionist conflict in all its dimensions and how this conflict should continue in the right direction and revolve around its central issue: the Palestinian issue.

If we presume that Habib can reach specific solutions to the problem which he came to solve--at any rate, such solutions will not go beyond being temporary solutions and we would like to stress that this is only a possibility--would this mean that matters will be settled and that the region would slumber on Philip Habib's silk pillow?

We are well aware that the crux of the issue is not the way Philip Habib portrays it or as the U.S. media and Western mass media in general portray it. For him the question is: Will the Arab confrontation actually continue to escalate against the Zionist enemy in Palestine and Lebanon?

Philip Habib came to give an American answer to this question, that is, through dividing the one issue into several dispersed parts which he will swallow one after the other. Yet since when did the Americans play the role of fate to which we cannot but succumb? We are well aware that the confrontation will continue, escalate and become even more acute as long as the guns confront daily the Americans and their agents and as long as the central issue--the Palestinian issue--is protected with the guns of its Palestinian and Arab sons, who are determinedly and persistently struggling to champion this issue with the power of arms and continued defiance.

SAUDI MINISTER STATES POSITION FOR GENEVA MEETING

LD201752 Hamburg DPA in German 1653 GMT 20 May 81

[Excerpt] Bonn, 20 May (DPA)--At the forthcoming OPEC conference in Geneva, Saudi Arabia will advocate that the price of oil should be frozen at the present level, not only during 1981 but also through 1982, and that it should subsequently be raised only in moderate stages. During a stopover at Cologne-Bonn airport today while en route to Geneva, Saudi Arabian Petroleum Minister Yamani said at a news conference that if no agreement can be reached in Geneva on the future price policy of the OPEC countries, Saudi Arabia will maintain its present prices. Both sides must show movement at Geneva, Yamani said, referring to the differences of views within OPEC.

The Saudi petroleum minister added that Saudi Arabia will not cut its present oil putput of 10 million barrels per day. Even, so, he does not believe that the price of oil will drop, at least as far as OPEC's official price of $32 per barrel is concerned. As far as the higher price demanded by several countries is concerned, market forces are so strong at present that they will exert a downward pressure on prices.

Yamani said that he is not worried about the state of the Western economy. Although the recession will continue until the end of 1981, especially in Europe, there will be a strong recovery in 1982.

AFP Report

NC201825 Paris AFP in English 1824 GMT 20 May 81

[Excerpt] Bonn, 20 May (AFP)--Saudi Arabia's Oil Minister Shaykh Ahmad Zaki Yamani said today that he would try to push through an oil price freeze until the end of 1982 when OPEC oil ministers meet in Geneva on Monday.

Shaykh Yamani, who stopped here on his way to West Berlin to attend an energy forum tomorrow, told journalists at the airport that he would also try to obtain "moderate oil prices after 1982." The Saudi minister stressed that the Western economy must be given a breathing space.

He declared that if members of the organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) could not agree on a price structure, Saudi Arabia would maintain its current prices.

Shaykh Yamani said that Saudi Arabia did not envisage reducing its oil output.

UAE MINISTER CALLS FOR DECREASED OIL PRODUCTION

JN191609 Manama GULF NEWS AGENCY in Arabic 1445 GMT 19 May 81

[Excerpts] Abu Dhabi, 19 May (GNA)--Dr Mani' Sa'id al-'Utaybah, UAE minister of petroleum and natural resources, has called on the OPEC member states to reduce their oil production in order to absorb the production surplus in the world markets which ranges from 2 to 3 million barrels per day.

Speaking here today before his departure for Amsterdam at the beginning of a tour of the Netherlands, Switzerland and Britain, Dr al-'Utaybah underlined the call for freezing present oil prices. He underlined the importance of reducing the contemporary price difference between the official Saudi price of $32 per barrel and the North African price of $41 per barrel of light crude oil.

Dr al-'Utaybah requested the 13 members of OPEC to unify all prices and revert to the one-price policy that was replaced by the two-price policy at the 1979 Qatar conference and by the three-price policy at the Bali conference last December.

KUWAIT

MINISTER SAYS ARMY 'WILL FIGHT' WITH SYRIA

JN210933 Damascus SANA in Arabic 0855 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] Kuwait, 21 May (SANA)--Kuwaiti Defense Minister Salim Sabah as-Salim as-Sabah has asserted that the Kuwaiti Army will fight alongside Syria if war were to break out between it and Israel. [Words indistinct] at a graduation ceremony of [words indistinct]. Kuwait's stand [words indistinct] fraternal Syria will be the same stand it adopted in 1967 and 1973 when the Kuwaiti Army, government and people stood alongside Syria [words indistinct] the treacherous Israeli aggressions.

SAUDI ARABIA

CROWN PRINCE FAHD INTERVIEWED ON MIDEAST PEACE

LD202130 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1735 GMT 20 May 81

[Interview with Crown Prince and Deputy Prime Minister Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz with SPA--date and place not given]

[Text] Riyadh, 20 May (SPA)--Question: In the last few days the kingdom has been the center of world attention as a result of the visits to it by several European leaders. What is Your Royal Highness' opinion of the results of these visits?

Answer: From the outset I want to confirm that the talks which we recently held with several Western officials were conducted in accordance with his majesty's directives. His majesty has always given us instructions and guidance on both domestic and foreign policy. During all the talks we adhered to his majesty's wish for the Palestinian problem to be the crux of the talks.

We in the kingdom believed for years that West Europe should end its colonialist presence in Arab countries so that we might begin to reap the fruit of common interests, cultural, political, civil and economic interests which the Arabs have in common with West Europe. As soon as the European colonialist presence ended, the scope for wide Arab-European cooperation emerged at all levels, and this cooperation was started. The importance of Arab-European cooperation increased following the 1967 defeat when as Arabs we felt the need for European stances to compensate for the bias in Israel's favor of the major Western position, that of the United States. With the signing of the Camp David accords the Arab and the European sides were all the more convinced of the need for the emergence of European role capable of influencing U.S. policy which might result in an alternative European initiative drastically different from Camp David, preparing the atmosphere for a just solution in our region. In order to create a suitable climate for a positive and effective European move we in Saudi Arabia were eager to establish the strongest relations with West European countries, and I am not revealing a secret when I say that we continue to take Europe's interests into consideration when we decide our oil policy in appreciation of Europe's importance for the Arabs, their problems and rights, especially the Palestinian problem. Within this context of our concept of Arab-European cooperation whose foundations were laid by his majesty comes our welcome for the British prime minister, Chancellor Schmidt and Chancellor Kreisky. In addition to the lengthy discussions of bilateral relations the rights of the Palestinian people took the lion's share of the talks.

We were pleased to received the British prime minister and see bilateral relations return to normal after last year's crisis. We felt that Mrs Thatcher has an encouraging understanding of the Arab stance, and we look forward to a positive British move within the next few weeks when Britain assumes chairmanship of the EEC Commission.

Britain in particular more than other European countries bears responsibility for the Palestinian people. It held the mandate for Palestine for 30 years, during which it opened the doors wide to Jewish immigration with the result that the number of Jews in Palestine rose from 56,000 at the start of the mandate to 650,000 at the end, when Israel was created, while the British forces, which had not completed their withdrawal, were confronting Begin's and Shamir's terrorist gangs who killed, hanged and tortured British soliders. Thus we hope that Britain will rectify this mistake for which it was responsible in its capacity as the holder of the mandate and which was manifested in the expulsion of the Palestinian people from their homeland instead of preparing them for self-determination in accordance with the mandate document.

Concerning Schmidt's visit, Begin's [illegible]outing and flagrant sweeping attack against the chancellor are an indication of the success of the visit. Indeed Chancellor Schmidt did not side with one side against the other; rather he stood by what is right and just. Begin does not accept this because of his terrorist and racialist nature. Schmidt's visit to the kingdom was extremely successful and was marked by mutual trust and understanding.

Regarding Kreisky, he is indeed a man of peace and was among the first European leaders who objectively and impartially grasped the Palestinian issue. Since then he has supported what is right and promoted peace with all the means and ideas at his disposal. We in the kingdom have every respect and friendship for this honest and sincere man and we are proud of Saudi-Austrian relations which have been consolidated owing to his leadership and foresight. And every meeting with Chancellor Kreisky is always for good and peace.

Question: Was Alexander Haig's visit to the kingdom successful?

Answer: I am fully satisfied with the visit of Mr Haig despite the difference in our viewpoints with regard to the Palestinian question. Since this was my first meeting with him, I found in him a readiness to understand. I heard from him something to indicate a just and durable peace in our region. I hope to feel soon the effects of this endeavor.

Question: What is Your Highness' opinion of the present clamor in the American press concerning the kingdom's intention to buy AWACS aircraft and sophisticated equipment for F-15 aircraft?

Answer: First, I would like to reiterate that the purchase of aircraft and equipment regardless of their type is a sovereign act; let there be no doubt that we will allow no one to infringe upon our right to exercise our sovereignty. Let everyone, far and near, Zionist pressure groups in the United States, or pro-Zionist reporters or hired spokesmen in the West, realize this.

In the kingdom we have followed the intensified campaign waged against us in recent weeks by the Zionist enemy and his agents in the West. Sometimes they say that the aircraft deal tips the balance of power in the region, at other times they allege that the deal will intensify the armament race among the Middle Eastern countries, and at yet other times they demand the cancellation of the deal as punishment to the kingdom for its stance on the two Camp David agreements. They also declare that the AWACS aircraft can observe the movements of the Israeli Army and that F-15 aircraft with their sophisticated equipment could strike any point in occupied Palestine by taking off from any point in the kingdom.

We have followed all this and more. We are surprised that such crooked logic still finds so much room in the American press to express itself. Do they want to say that Israel, which occupies all the territories of Palestine by force of arms from the sea to the river in addition to other Arab territories, which daily attacks both the Palestinian and the Lebanese peoples by land, sea and air with the most modern weapons of destruction and which flies in the skies over Beirut, Sidon, Tyre, An-Nabatiyah and Al-Ayshiyah with its aircraft causing death and destruction for the refugees in the camps and for peaceful civilians, showing contempt for the will of the international community and for the UN resolutions, that this Israel is today wailing, saying that the Saudis threaten its security, and that they have disturbed the balance of power?

What is ridiculous is the fact that responsible members of the U.S. Congress repeat such words within an orchestrated and coordinated Zionist campaign. We wish that these members would visit southern Lebanon to see with their own eyes who is threatening whom, who is attacking whom, and who is killing whom. This farce peaked with the statement attributed recently to Begin in the American TIME magazine, when he said: "If the deal goes through, then the day in which this takes place will be the worst day in the history of the United States, Israel and the Free World. The deal will be the gravest thing to happen to the security of Israel."

Let Begin and his Zionist trumpets realize that the deal is part of the plan for building a modern Saudi Army capable of performing its duties. The odd voices which are raised to disturb and confuse will not prevent us from proceeding with our plan because the doors of the world are open to us.

Question: Israel has recently escalated its barbarous daily attacks on southern Lebanon in a way to which we have previously not been accustomed. What is Your Highness opinion?

Answer: There is no doubt that the sad state which the current Arab situation has reached was the major cause that encouraged Israel to escalate its military operations against the Palestinians and Lebanese. The Arab nation lacks even the lowest level of solidarity achieved at the 1978 Baghdad summit. This is a very serious matter. For some time we in the kingdom have been warning of the gravity of the situation. We demand and persistently stress the need for the Arab house to be put in order. The more the Arab situation deteriorates the further Israel goes in its aggression and arrogance. Some days ago Begin talked in Galilee about destroying the Palestinians; today he talks about killing the Palestinians. This is a war of extermination. The Arabs must not allow it to continue. National duty requires the rapid closing of Arab ranks and the adoption of practical measure to halt the growing Zionist danger. Yesterday it was Jerusalem, today it is southern Lebanon, and tomorrow the Golan Heights. The matter requires a universal pan-Arab confrontation.

In any event, if the Palestinian presence were not terrifying, Begin would not have thus lost his reason. We in the kingdom salute the heroic steadfastness of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples in the face of the Israeli war machine. We support and back fraternal Syria in its steadfast and gallant stand against Israel. The enormous responsibility borne by Damascus at this stage under the leadership of Brother Hafiz al-Asad requires all of us to lend support and backing. Today the Syrian stand represents the will of the Arab nation who will not allow Israel to dictate its will to it despite the absence of Arab solidarity. If Israel were to attack Syria all the Arabs would fight with and alongside Syria.

We hope that the coming conference of Arab foreign ministers will live up to the level of the great challenge facing our Arab nation, will succeed in correcting the Arab course and will restore the solidarity displayed at the 1978 Baghdad summit.

Question: Now that 100 days have passed since Reagan became president, what is the level of the kingdom's relations with the Reagan administration, and what is Your Royal Highness's evaluation of these relations?

Answer: We are happy to see President Reagan recover his health and resume his tasks. Our relations with President Reagan's administration are cordial and good, and there is no dispute between us other than the Palestinian problem and the rights of the Palestinian people, which we believe requires a less biased American stance in favor of the Zionist enemy and a more equitable one toward the Palestinian people to achieve a just and lasting solution guaranteeing the rights of all. And we have more than one reason to believe that President Reagan with his popularity, open administration and political vision is capable of playing a prominent and effective role in ending the vicious circle of blood and death which has lasted for many years in the Middle East. At the level of bilateral relations the attitude of the American Government toward the aircraft deal continues to be encouraging despite the fierce campaign waged by the information media.

Question: Since we are talking about southern Lebanon, what is the opinion of Your Royal Highness concerning the situation in Lebanon?

Answer: The situation in Lebanon is one of the weak points in the Arab stand, because Lebanon's strength is strength for the Arabs and its weakness is weakness for the Arabs. The fighting raging in Lebanon among the sons of one people, the bloodshed of innocents and the ensuing destruction and ruin pain the soul and are cause for sorrow and grief. Lebanon's recovery of health is our top priority, and this will be effected only through consolidation of the efforts by the Lebanese and Syrian Governments to achieve national reconciliation among all the warring parties and through the consolidation of Lebanese legitimacy as represented in the president of the republic. Undoubtedly Israel's eagerness to undermine any effort aimed at achieving Lebanese reconciliation was one of the reasons why it escalated its military operations in Lebanon so that Begin might benefit in his election campaign from the continued fighting and tension.

Question: What does Your Royal Highness think of the strong attack made by Begin against the kingdom, in which he said that the kingdom could not play a constructive role in defusing the tense situation in the region?

Answer: The fact that Begin even speaks of the Saudi role indicates two things: First, such a role exists, and second, Begin perceives our role to the extent of feeling annoyance and of losing his nerve. What else can we expect from this terrorist, Zionist and racist other than curses? Begin's flagrant attack against the kingdom is an honor of which we are proud; this convinces us all the more of the soundness and effectiveness of our positions, and this enhances our determination to continue to shoulder our Arab and pan-Arab responsibilities. Begin's wholesale curses against the kingdom remind us of the poet's words: If my enemy calls me imperfect, this proves that I am perfect.

MINISTER SEES PROGRESS IN COOPERATION WITH U.S.

LD201015 Jidda 'UKAZ in Arabic 17 May 81 p 1

[By Muhammad ad-Duwaysh]

[Excerpt] Riyadh--His Excellency Minister of Finance and National Economy Shaykh Muhammad Aba al-Khayl has asserted that the Saudi-U.S. committee for economic and technical cooperation has made great progress in the field of cooperation between the two countries, especially in the field of development and providing the expertise and technical know-how which the country needs at the present stage. His excellency said that about 20 major programs within the joint committee's work have been implemented in addition to many other programs earmarked for implementation. A series of meetings began in Riyadh yesterday between His Excellency Minister of Finance and National Economy Shaykh Muhammad Aba al-Khayl and His Excellency U.S. Treasury Secretary Donald Regan. The meetings were attended by Shaykh 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Qurayshi, governor of the Saudi currency board.

'ALI MEETS WITH STERNER, MAKES STATEMENT

NC201609 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1522 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Cairo, 20 May (MENA)--A meeting was held this afternoon at the Foreign Ministry between Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali and U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Michael Sterner, who returned from Israel last night.

The 90-minute meeting was attended by Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali and Foreign Ministry First Under Secretary Dr Usamah al-Baz.

Kamal Hasan 'Ali said after the meeting that during the meeting he reaffirmed Egypt's position that the multinational peacekeeping force for Sinai should have a limited size suitable for fulfilling its tasks in the area according to the peace treaty. He added that it has been intially estimated that the force will consist of 2,000 or 2,500 men, including three battalions to be stationed in Sharm ash-Shaykh and Rafah as well as observers--who will be part of the multinational force--to be stationed in Area 'D' inside the Israeli borders.

"Ali added that the multinational force will be formed from states to be agreed upon by Egypt, the United States and Israel.

Kamal Hasan 'Ali also said: Egypt would have preferred it if the Sinai peacekeeping force were to be a UN emergency force, but, unfortunately, the Security Council chairman has informed us that the council is unable to form a UN emergency force for several reasons.

He added: The multinational force will be the alternative to a UN emergency force, in the hope that in the future our wish to have a UN emergency force may be fulfilled.

Answering a question by the press after the meeting, Kamal Hasan 'Ali said: The question of the states that will contribute to the multinational force has not been discussed yet. However, consultations will begin with the states that might participate in the multinational force after the tripartite meeting scheduled to be held on 26 and 27 May and which may be extended by 1 more day. We will try to have a multinational force geographically representing the world, that is, representing a number of continents.

Kamal Hasan 'Ali said that in its capacity as a full partner in the peace efforts and the peace agreement and in the light of this commitment the United States will hold contacts with the countries in addition to Egypt's efforts to agree on the states which will participate in the force.

In reply to another question he said that there are still some points pertaining to the multinational force which are under discussion.

A meeting will be held this evening between the Egyptian side, led by Dr Usamah al-Baz, and the U.S. side, led by Michael Sterner, to discuss these points in implementation of the provisions of the peace treaty prior to the drafting of an aide-memoire concerning the multinational force, which will be tantamount to an annex to the peace agreement.

It has been learned that the force will be headed by a U.S. civilian, who will have political status, since the United States is a third partner. His duty will be to contact the two sides. The military commander of the force will be from another nationality--from the states taking part in the force. The Egyptian civilian authority will have full authority and sovereignty over every inch of Sinai. The multinational force will have the same immunity enjoyed by UN observers and UN emergency forces anywhere in the world. The period of stay and powers of the force will be based on the provisions of the peace treaty. Furthermore, the force will be equipped with light weapons only.

The early warning stations, which presently exist in Sinai, and which are manned by civilians, as well as the UN observers force which consists of 87 members, will continue to exist.

Kamal Hasan 'Ali stated that after agreement is reached on the multinational force it is expected that he will discuss with the Israeli side the question of the stages of Israeli withdrawal from the last part of Sinai, which should be completed before 25 April 1982.

'ALI ON LEBANON, SINAI FORCE, AUTONOMY TALKS

NC201340 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali has stated that Egypt has said hands off Lebanon and called for the prevention of any intervention that might escalate the situation because such an escalation would not be in the interest of Lebanon. Egypt, he said, has held contacts with the world states with the aim of preserving Lebanon's unity and independence and settling the present crisis, be this by deploying UN forces or joint Arab forces, so that the Syrian forces will not have a free hand in Lebanon.

'Ali also said that if the Arab foreign ministers conference scheduled to be held in Tunis succeeds in forming an Arab force to reduce the Syrian presence in Lebanon, this may ease the escalation in Lebanon.

Kamal Hasan 'Ali said that the negotiations on setting up a multinational force are continuing, that there are points of agreement and points of disagreement, but that the points of disagreement can be resolved. The Security Council, he added, has confirmed its inability to form a UN peacekeeping force.

On the autonomy negotiations, Kamal Hasan 'Ali said that Egypt is awaiting the results of the Israeli elections. He added that Egypt is endeavoring to maintain the peace momentum.

DEFENSE MINISTER ON 5-YEAR ARMAMENT PLAN

LD201415 Cairo AL-AHRAM in Arabic 17 May 81 p 1

[Excerpt] Vice President Husni Mubarak today will receive the U.S. military delegation currently visiting Cairo.

Minister of Defense and War Production Lt Gen Muhammad 'Abd al-Halim Abu Ghazalah said that the main subject of military discussions with the U.S. side is an armament program aimed at rejuvenating the armed forces' blood within 5 years, from 1982 to 1987.

Abu Ghazalah made this statement following his meeting with U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary Francis West. The U.S. side, he said, has no objections on the issues of arming but has defined the amounts of money avaiable for the purchase of equipment. He said: The U.S. side submitted two proposals to us, which we have studied, and today we submitted a proposal to them which suits our circumstances. The U.S. side accepted it in principle, but will study it from the aspect of delivery schedules.

This plan, Lieutenant General Abu Ghazalah added, is the first 5-year plan for the development of the armed forces and will be followed by anther plan which provides for the development of the weapons and equipment of the armed services: the land, naval, air and air defense forces.

Abu Ghazalah added: We have plans to develop the armed forces up to 1990. Details of these plans may be altered, but we will pursue their outline. The new delivery schedules of arms and equipment agreed upon will come into effect this year after the U.S. side has approved them.

AS-SADAT CORRECTIVE REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY ADDRESS

NC141110 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 0958 GMT 14 May 81

[Address by Egyptian President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat at a joint meeting of the People's Assembly and the Consultative Council on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the 15 May corrective revolution--live in linkup relay of Cairo transmitters]

[Text] In the name of God. Brothers and sisters, members of the People's Assembly and Consultative Council: Before starting my talk to you on this immortal anniversary, the 10th anniversary of the corrective revolution, which began 10 years ago from this hall, precisely--the hall of the People's Assembly and the representatives of the people --before starting my talk to you, I would like to declare in your name and that of our people our denunciation of what befell Pope John Paul yesterday--the pope of the Catholic Church, the man of love, fraternity, serenity and brilliance. He was attacked yesterday. We must denounce this attack because the man is dear to all the hearts in the contemporary world. He is a man, as I said, who represents the pure essence of Christianity.

Egypt, as an Islamic state, repudiates the fact that this treacherous and criminal action has been committed by somebody who belongs to Islam. This has no connection with Islam. Our God Almighty ordered us in the Holy Koran to believe in the messages of Moses and Christ and the messages of all the prophets and never to discriminate among any of them. The perpetrator of the incident cannot at all be a believer in any of the three divine religions. Our best wishes and greetings to this revered bishop and our supplications to God Almighty to grant him recovery, in order that he may resume the discharge of his message of love, fraternity, peace, serenity and brilliance. [applause]

I will now recurn to my talk on this momentous occasion. It was 10 years ago that your assembly adopted at this hall its historic decision to dismiss its speaker, the two deputy speakers and 16 other deputies, who represented the centers of power. What is strange is that some continue to argue whether what happened on 15 May was a revolution or not. They follow the same old pattern of argument, which we should have completely gotten rid of on 23 July 1952.

What happened at this hall 10 years ago, precisely on this date, is enough. This assembly adopted at that time its historic decision to dismiss its speaker, the 2 deputy speakers and 16 deputies. If this was not a revolution, then how would this measure and momentous historic decision be described, regardless of the following events which completely changed the face of history in Egypt.

We have no time to answer those. Time only allows me to review with you the past 10 years, what has been done and what we have accomplished during them. God Almighty wants to honor all of us as we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the May revolution. God Almighty wants to honor all of us and to bestow his blessings on us. On the 10th anniversary of the May revolution God Almighty places his hands over our heads to bless our efforts and steps. We can be proud today of all the great achievements that have been accomplished in the past 10 years. We are entitled to be proud that God Almighty is guiding our steps and is blessing our efforts.

Since the beginning of the corrective revolution we have been waging three battles--the battle of democracy, the battle of peace and the battle of building prosperity.

Let us discuss first the battle of building democracy. As you have heard me say before, brothers and sisters, the sixth principle of the 23 July revolution called for the establishment of a sound, democratic life, and I here underline the word "sound." Also I have told you before, the application or implementation of this principle was obstructed until the May revolution came into being.

As you know, I assumed office on 16 October 1970. During the last 2 months of 1970, I issued an order abolishing the sequestration of property except by law in the event the people's supreme interest necessitates this and following an application by the socialist prosecutor and an approval of such an application by a judge. Previously, sequestration was imposed through an administrative order, but now only through a judge. That was at the end of 1970, that is, 2 months after I took office.

Then came May 1971, that is, 7 or 8 months after I assumed office. What happened during the May revolution? Your assembly adopted a historic resolution that was in itself a full-fledged revolution. I say this to answer those who like to argue about this. Then the detention camps were closed forever. I want to put forward a question: Has anyone been detained since I assumed office on 16 October 1970?

Nobody was arrested after I assumed office on 16 October 1970, because, very simply, I had then asked the interior minister that no arrest warrant be issued unless signed by me in my capacity as the military governor general. The practice earlier was that the interior minister issued the arrest warrant and then submitted it to the governor general. Since I assumed office, I have asked that nobody be arrested unless I sign the warrant. Nobody has been arrested since. However, you will find one arrest warrant which I signed. It involved my brother, because his sons had attacked their neighbors, who complained to me. They were our neighbors for 25 years. [applause]

Nobody was arrested from when I assumed office and until the detention camps were closed in May 1971. The only exception was my brother, and this is a fact. The detention camps were closed and we began drafting the constitution. We called it the permanent construction then. There is no need to include the word permanent or provisional, but the fact is that with the exception of the 23 July revolution, all the constitutions were either provisional or the country was ruled by a constitutional proclamation. The legal experts know that this could be done temporarily, but that it cannot constitute a permanent constitutional action. Therefore, our constitutions were either provisional or the country was being ruled by a constitutional proclamation. This is why the term permanent constitution was mentioned. But we must not use the word permanent because a constitution is a constitution and, basically, it must be permanent. This was proved in the past 10 years. Has the constitution been interrupted for a single hour? No. The constitution has not been interrupted for even 1 hour since it was issued 10 years ago, and it will not be interrupted in the future, God willing. [applause]

The detention camps were closed for good in 1971, the year which marked the beginning of the May revolution. The constitution was issued, the supremacy of law was upheld and the eavesdropping tapes were burned. All administrative measures against individuals were canceled and all measures must now conform with the law. This happened in 1971, when we were building democracy. All the judges were reinstituted in 1972 and the beginning of 1973. I ordered that one of them be reinstituted although he had reached retirement age. He was reinstituted as other judges, even though he had been retired. The fact that he had reached retirement age was not enough to keep him away. He was reinstituted. From this date, no overbearing person can argue that the judiciary has taken its position at the top, as it always did, among us. No overbearing person can argue this. All this was for the building of democracy. The detention camps were closed, the permanent constitution was issued, the supremacy of law was upheld and all the judges, including those who were retired, were reinstituted. The immunity of the judiciary was fully restored. All this was done for the sake of building democracy.

War broke out in October 1973. As we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the corrective revolution, I want to state before you, honorable assembly, that as opposed to what happens all over the world, no Egyptian citizen was arrested either before, during or after the October war. I place this fact in your records.

During World War II, Britain, the mother of democracy, detained some people, including members of the House of Commons. In Egypt no one was detained either before, during or after the war, despite the vileness of some people who are known to you. Despite this, none of them was detained. Some of them filled the world with talk about defeatism, imperialism and that Egypt would not wage a war. They raised doubt among the people about the battle, either by frightening them through articles or propaganda or by borrowing the spirit of defeat from the Lebanese press and attempting to plant it in our press. No one was detained. At the beginning of 1973 I could have gathered these malicious persons--and they know themselves--and put them in a detention camp and then frankly told the people about them.

I do nothing surreptitiously. For 10 years we have been working publicly and all the world can see us. The aim is that our people must have a first-hand knowledge of everything. By God, if I detained them and told people that I arrested those villains until our battle was over, the people would have agreed with me. However, I did not do this. Why? Because I do not like to harm our work with any emotional outburst. Only those who are weak resort to such measures. We are not weak. Why should we harm the sanctity of our work through such measures?

When at the beginning of 1973 I wanted to tell the journalists that some of them had fled abroad and that others inside the country were importing defeatism from Lebanon and were writing defeatist articles, I sent some journalists to the Information Department, but their salaries and allocations were not affected and no one was harmed. On 28 September 1973, that is, a short period before the battle, I returned all of them to their original posts. At that time they thought and said that I wanted to conclude a reconciliation with them, because without them I could not do anything. The stupid ones did not know that the battle would start on 6 October. [applause]

What happened after the battle? In February 1974, I lifted the censorship on the press forever. You have tried me. I do not make a decision or take a measure and then retract it. When I adopt a decision, I know the responsibility it entails, like the decision to form a multiparty system and all the consequences it has brought upon us. However, we must face and accept this, because this is the most proper method in our age for democracy and for the opinion and counteropinion. We must face all the defects. However, as I have accustomed you to know and as we have accustomed our people to know, I do not make retractions as long as we have adopted our decision jointly.

In February 1974, that is, 4 months after the battle, the censorship was lifted. It has not been imposed up to now and it will not be reimposed. The October paper was then issued.

The first disengagement was effected in 1975. We began the policy of liberalization for the building of democracy. It was not only an economic liberalization. It was a complete liberalization in the full sense of the word, including the democratic liberalization. The October paper, whoever reads it now, has become a part of history. After our constitutional legitimacy, the sole document is our constitution, nothing else--no charters or the like. We are like any other state with deep-rooted democracy. That which governs the state and defines the relations between the ruler and the ruled and organizes the life is the constitution, which we draw up by our free will and choice. With the October paper, I wanted to provide assurances.

Then came 1975. From 1974 we were preparing for the reopening of the Suez Canal. This was also liberalization. In 1972 you heard me say that our bankruptcy was about to be declared. When we failed to meet the installments, the U.S. Import and Export Bank sought to declare our bankruptcy and actually applied to the World Bank. McNamara, a dear friend of mine and director of the World Bank to this day, but he is leaving it this year, had secretly sent an envoy to ask me to arrange for $1 million in any way and send them to him. This was because the Import and Export Bank applied for the declaration of Egypt's bankruptcy for failing to pay the installments due.

McNamara said he wanted to silence the Bank and its claim. For a whole week we were searching for $1 million in Egypt. That was in 1972.

In 1974, immediately after the first disengagement, we began clearing the Suez Canal. The liberalization was firstly for the purpose of finding $1 million, when the need arises. Secondly, Egypt, through its history, has been dear to itself, dear to its Arab nation and dear to its Islamic nation. I felt that there was an inclination in the Arab world--regrettable material wealth blinds the eyes--for them to deal with Egypt on the basis that it was defeated and was in need of them. Therefore, when I declared the reopening of the canal the Syrians instigated the Palestinians, and the rest of the Arabs began whispering, and Libya near us said how could As-Sadat reopen the Suez Canal--as though we must keep the canal closed. We must leave the three cities along the canal without people who were suffering. All this so that the Arabs would be pleased with us. On reopening the canal its revenue in the first year amounted to $400 million. It was not $1 million for which I had looked for a whole week. The yearly revenue became $400 million. We can see how God blessed this today. [applause]

In 1976 I presented the paper on platforms. Was this not the democracy. We must move from the one party, one organization and one opinion to the multiparty system--but not in one bounce. You have seen the outcome of bouncing in Portugal, where to this date, and for many years to come, it does not enjoy stability. We are not beginning from a vacuum. Here is a state and continuous achievements. We had a war in which dignity, glory and construction were achieved.

I issued the paper on platforms, which was debated in your assembly and your committees. Three platforms were agreed upon--center, right and left. Which if the political trends in the world includes more than these three trends--center, right and left? They could possibly include extreme right, extreme left, left of the right. All this is possible, but the basic is center, right and left. They entered the battle of 1974.

I came to this place and from this podium opened the first session of the 1976 elected parliament--after the lapse of 5 years, which was the constitutional term of the previous parliament. When I opened the first session of the second parliament, I addressed my speech to your brother and sister members of the assembly then and told them: You have entered the electoral campaign in platforms, but your behavior was that of parties.

Why shouldn't we call things by their names and why shouldn't you become parties--parties of the center, right and the left. We started the parties at once after my speech here on the occasion of the inauguration of the assembly's new session in 1976 after the elections. This was a democracy established by the shortest cut. We could have kept the platforms and the 1976 parliament would have completed these platforms and the following parliament would have formed the parties. No. I saw that the election was actually conducted in a party manner. Why, then, not call things by their names and not waste the people's time. I declared from this platform, this place at your esteemed assembly, that the three existing platforms constitute three parties.

To organize this, as a democratic and constitutional country, it was necessary to issue the law organizing the parties, the party's law was issued. In view of the fact that we had adopted the multiparty system, it was necessary to establish a strong opposition. Why? It is because, as we had agreed, it has been proved that despite all its flaws the ideal solution for establishing democracy, freedom and the counteropinion in today's world is the multiparty system. Well, a multiparty system should also provide for a strong opposition.

There is a multiparty system now, I want to tell you. The countries which have many parties have two systems. The first is a multiparty system with two major parties and some other small parties. This is applied in Britain and the United States. The second is a multiparty system with a proportional list such as the system applied in some European states and Israel.

Under this system, there are no two major parties but several parties and the seats and votes are distributed according to the proportional list. If you ask my opinion, then I favor the adoption of the first system of two major parties and several small parties, because this provides some stability, as we can see.

I asked that a research be conducted in this respect. Dr Amal Fahmi conducted a very valuable research, which I will send to you for debate, related to the opposition in Britain and the United States. The question of opposition, as I have explained to you, is a solution which must be discussed. I actually request you to discuss it in full.

In 1976, as I have said, we submitted the paper on the platforms, which have turned into parties. It was necessary to form an opposition. The parties law was issued and for the sake of seriousness, we said that anyone who wants to form a party must have 20 deputies at least. Why? It is because when the paper on the platforms was being discussed at your assembly here, 41 applications were submitted to us to form 41 platforms.

Well, when our revolution broke out on 23 July 1952 and we issued the parties law, we received 21 applications to form 21 parties. When we were discussing the question of platforms in 1976, we received applications to form 41 platforms, that is to say 41 parties. This is why I said that I favor the democracy of a multiparty system with two major parties regardless of whether these parties have the same ideology as the case is in the United States where capitalism and open economy is the ideology of the Democratic and Republican parties or as in Britain where the two major parties have different ideologies. The Conservative Party is the party of the leisure class and the Labor Party is the party of the working classes. The Labor Party has a socialist trend and the Conservative Party advocates absolute capitalism. Their ideologies differ. Both provide an example.

There is one ideology in the United States and two main parties, together with small parties. In England there are two main parties with different ideologies, along with some other small parties. I will present all of this to you for discussion and entrenching the system.

As I have told you in the law on the parties, we put a reservation, no, not a reservation but a paragraph to show our seriousness. Why? Because an absolute multiparty system, that is, 41 parties, would dismember national unity in our country.

Some people may say there is freedom in the multiparty system. Yes, but we have lessons to learn from a multiparty system. In Palestine, with a population of 1.5 million, there were 17 parties.

Every family constituted a party and every party accused the other of betrayal. In Indonesia, had it not been for Sukarno, there would have been 23 parties. A great number of parties disintegrates national unity.

I will go even further: When the United States signed its independence in Philadelphia, enacted the constitution and established the United States for the first time as an independent state after its victorious war against England--when they met in Philadelphia, enacted the constitution and began implementing it, the United States consisted of 13 states--today the United States is 50 states. In Congress the Americans refused party life and parties for 12 years after independence. Three presidents--each with a 4-year term in office since the Declaration of Independence and the enactment of the constitution in Philadelphia--the United States, the Congress and the president, refused the formation of parties for 12 years. Why? They said: The United States consists of 13 states, parties might deepen the differences instead of unifying the 13 states.

The nature of parties is to reflect differences. As is usually the case parties are blind. Regrettably, before the 23 July revolution and continuing up to this time they carry on with the same method.

For 12 years the Americans refused to form a party. At that time the United States was only ruled by a president and Congress. What I am telling you about occurred 200 years ago, when the United States upheld national unity and social peace.

We made the condition of 20 members of the People's Assembly in order to give some seriousness to the issue so that we would not find 41 parties or the state of things that prevailed before the 23 July revolution.

It was a funny thing when the Wafd Party and all the other parties formed a national front in 1936. Among them was a party called the Union Party. As you well know, this party was formed by King Fu'ad. There was a pasha in the party. There were many silly things. What was the Union Party? Who was in this Union Party in Egypt at that time? We made the condition of 20 members of the People's Assembly in order to give some seriousness to the formation of parties. All right, when we found that this condition was an obstruction. [as heard]

Before this we had the experience of the New Wafd Party which was formed to settle accounts and to return to the state of affairs of 30 years ago. They incited someone to question the rights of workers and peasants, saying that there is no such thing in the world where 50 percent [of the members of the People's Assembly] are workers and peasants. They said that this is new and that no country in the world gives 50 percent of the seats to workers and peasants. They pushed them to say this, as usual, as a trial balloon and so on and so forth.

You saw their conduct because they were with you here in the assembly. They wanted to return to the past. I wish it were a return without spite, but it was a return full of grudges and settling of accounts.

Furthermore, should we remove 30 years of our history and bring back those who were not the second generation but the first generation? They were here in this hall when the British Embassy secretary would come here to the speaker of the People's Assembly, ordering him to change the petition--and it was changed.

These are the people who wanted to rule Egypt again. And who are they? People with high posts, pashas and those who have titles of his excellency and so on and so forth.

Here in this hall, the leader, secretary and deputies of the majority party used to tremble with fear of a secretary in the British Embassy. Fikri Abazah, may God bless his soul, related this. They evicted him from the meeting. Abazam told them: Where are the minutes of yesterday's meeting? The custom, as you know, is that whenever you hold a meeting you must bring the minutes of the previous meeting. Where are the minutes? They told him: Here they are in front of you. He said: But these minutes do not contain what happened during the meeting. They told him: These are the minutes.

Those were the ones who were supposed to return in the name of democracy. We were naive to believe that time or the revolution would make them change their attitude. No, their souls remained the same and even became worse than they were before 23 July revolution. We passed through this experiment.

We then decided to allow the formation of an opposition party. It was necessary to collect the signature of 20 People's Assembly members in order to enable the Labor Party to form an opposition party. No one wanted to sign. We took all the NDP members of the People's Assembly and went to the adjacent second building of the People's Assembly. There, all of the NDP members of the People's Assembly--and not just 20 deputies--signed a petition for the formation of the opposition party.

The meaning of this is that we believe in democracy and in opinion and counteropinion. We need a strong opposition, just as the ruling party is strong. The government is strong and your party is the strongest party your country has ever known. [applause]

When we talk about freedom, it is high time here in your assembly to let everyone know his limit when he talks about freedom. Before the opposition was established in 1976--when there were platforms, then parties and then opposition--no one in Egypt had his freedom or dignity infringed upon. There was martial law but I did not use it until I abolished it last year.

You must put a stop to those who are complaining about the lack of democracy and freedom, because this has become a kind of buffoonery, childishness and a waste of time for the country. We signed for the formation of the Labor Party. I personally introduced the leader of the Labor Party to the country, as I knew him. We wanted a strong opposition.

Moreover, following the signing of the peace treaty with Israel, we held elections in 1979. I asked the people to vote in a referendum because this was a historic turning point and it was necessary to let the people have their say. Your honorable assembly approved of this. The people decided that we should hold elections and they laid down nine points for constructing a new edifice, because this was a turning point.

In those elections of 1979, the Labor Party won 30 seats. For the first time, I reveal that this was a result of an agreement reached between me and the leader of the party in Suez. We did not share booties or make an alliance like the alliances that are taking place now. I met with the leader of the Labor Party in Suez. I agreed to give his party 30 seats, including his constituency. We agreed that the NDP should not run candidates in 30 constituencies. We also agreed that should an NDP member run for elections in any of these constituencies, we would vote for the Labor Party candidate. The Labor Party thus won 30 seats.

I am revealing this to show how hard we worked in order to see the opposition get established. This is because some are rudely saying that the NDP does not want an opposition. Only, in the last elections for this honorable assembly, I agreed with the leader of the Labor Party to give his party 30 seats, including his constituency. When an NDP member wanted to run for elections in that constituency, I threatened to dismiss him. Until the last moment he was bent on running for election. I told him: Never. We gave our word. [applause] All the NDP deputies signed for the formation of the opposition party. In the elections, I agreed with the leader of the party to give his party 30 seats.

Well, what happened? I will not say anything more. I will only relate a story. All of you have heard that Callaghan was here last week. Callaghan was the former British Labor Party leader. He was also the prime minister of the British Labor Cabinet and then he became the leader of the opposition. When a person used to be a party leader, but is no longer a party leader, he stays in the opposition party.

I want to give you this example to save myself from more talk. Callaghan came to me. Callaghan has been a dear friend ever since he was in office as prime minister and then as Labor Party leader. As you know, he resigned from the Labor Party in order to give an opportunity to the young men.

However, the entire session I had with him indicated that he was pained over the party. Callaghan, who is in his seventies, told me: The party is part of my blood and my whole self. Why? Because I asked him about the Democratic Socialist Party which had separated from the Labor Party after Michael Foot, who succeeded as Labor Party leader, was leading it to the left.

Callaghan is still in the Labor Party and did not join the new Democratic Socialist Party. No, Callaghan is loyal to history and to his party. He has remained in the Labor Party, saying that he will continue in the party in order to persuade Michael Foot not to lead the party to the left. However, as a result of the Labor Party's move to the left by the new leader, Michael Foot, some of the labor members of parliament formed a new party, a democratic, socialist party like ours. They have the same ideology as ours.

In my discussion with Callaghan, I told him that historically democratic socialism must triumph in Britain. Why? Because there was no Labor Party when democracy began in Britain. Democracy in Britain began with the Conservative Party. This was followed by the class party and then by the Liberal Party which ruled Britain. A memorandum on the research I promised you will be sent to you, so that you can read all about this and know how the opposition is created.

I told him that the future is for democratic socialism because it is also our national system. Democratic socialism will not allow capitalism, which grinds people in its path, and it will not allow Marxism, which places all the people in solid molds and the human being is only a rivet and no more. In comparing these two, our democratic socialism respects the dignity of man and provides equal opportunities.

I told Callaghan: The future is for democratic socialism. He told me: I agree with you, but my blood and my whole being is in the Labor Party. I will stay in the Labor Party and I will try to persuade Michael Foot.

We were discussing this in complete frankness. Callaghan is my friend. Mrs Thatcher, who is now in office, is also my friend. She visited me here long before the elections --before she came to power, and met many of my aides and brothers here. I had a long session with her. In view of my relationship, Callaghan speaks unreservedly before me. However, first he brought the British ambassador with him. Second, in front of the British ambassador--as they were lunching with me--Callaghan said: The ambassador is present with us because I want to apply the values we have in Britian. I am in the opposition, Mrs Thatcher is in the government.

I know how Callaghan differs with her, but the traditions of the mother of democracy say that any person of the opposition who is outside Britain still represents the Labor Party. He also acknowledges Mrs Thatcher, who is in power, the Conservative Party and Great Britain.

Callaghan's statement may be referred to in an interview he gave to Hamdi Fu'ad published in AL-AHRAM 5 days ago. He said he was keen on preserving Britain's democratic ethics, namely, that while he was abroad he would not criticize his government, but will speak of Britain as Britain's Conservatives and Labor. He brought the British ambassador along with him. As you know, the ambassador would naturally submit a report to the prime minister.

I present this to the Labor Party. Why? The leader of the Labor Party knows that the Palestinian conference, which was held in Damascus, was one in a chain of campaigns for insulting Egypt. He heard what Al-Asad said. Al-Asad suddenly became democratic there. He struck against Aleppo with tanks and guns. He struck Zahlah with tanks and guns. By God, I didn't know what he was achieving, for I was not informed that Syrian SAM 6 missiles shot down an Israeli plane over the Al-Biqa' plain. Where is he leading Lebanon to? Where is he leading Syria to?

Al-Asad met a party leader, a self-styled leader of the opposition in Egypt. We no longer recognize this. A minority party, yes, it was mistaken to think that I came today to abolish the opposition. Throughout my life, as I told you, we are accustomed not to retreat from our decisions. We would rectify things, but not by destroying democracy. No. No to opposition and the leader of the opposition, but yes to a minority party. There is nothing to this. [applause]

The leader of the Labor Party sat at the conference and heard Al-Asad abusing Egypt. The Palestinians--you know who the Palestinians are. He did not defend his country. I present the story of Callaghan not as a leader of the opposition but one of the opposition. I present this story of the Labor Party so that they may know the meaning of the opposition. It is a big word which none of them is able to understand. I will leave it until the time comes. After you see the research I am sending you, we will agree on how the opposition should be established. Why? [applause]

The opposition, as it will be evident to you, is not established by decree or law. Never! It is established by practice, not by decree. Let us say two major parties and some small parties or small parties on the list. Never! For it is through practice that the opposition is established. I present this story to him.

I will tell you another story. Last year a meeting was held in New York by American University graduates. The meeting in New York included Arabs from all the Arab countries. You know that there is an American University in Beirut and another in Cairo, and that there are many graduates from the Arab world. There were also graduates from Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan and Egypt.

They met in New York last year. The Iraqi graduate stood up to defend the bloody massacres of Saddam Husayn. He had not then adopted a decision on Iran. The graduate stood up to defend the bloody massacres when Saddam Husayn killed 22 of his friends and colleagues in the command. The Syrian graduate stood up to defend Al-Asad. The Jordanian stood up to defend King Husayn. All of them defended their country.

The British delegate stood up--so that you may know the ethics of the people, not those of an individual as Callaghan--and said: Do not expect me to say a word about my country because outside Britain we never speak about the government or the rules, but when we feel something we debate this in our country openly, between us and our ruler. However, here you may know that British democracy does not allow me to speak of the rule in our country. If you want to know my views, wait until I arrive in Britain, where I will write this in a newspaper for you to read.

At the time, in the Arab countries, Al-Asad was striking Aleppo and his people with tanks and guns. You know the situation in Jordan and in Iraq. All the graduates, excluding the Egyptians, defended their country.

I will send you all this material to be kept in your honorable assembly, because the time has come. May God bless our daughter, whose name is ('Azzah) from Ad-Dammam, who has told them: Why are you selling your mother, Egypt? Why are you selling your mother, Egypt?

Does the one who publishes articles or attacks his country abroad think that the people will respect him? Nothing can affect his country. Why? Because every one in every part of the world knows Egypt, its policy, and fully respects it. Such people just show that they are without character or morals. [applause]

See what the Egyptian girl in Ad-Dammam is saying. She sent her letter to Kuwait. Kuwait is the place in which, regrettably, we are being attacked with bitter hatred. This began with the rulers themselves. The people follow their rulers. If their rulers are like that, the people will be the same.

What did she tell them in her letter? [As-Sadat apparently reading from the letter] Yes, Egypt is the mother of us all, whether we want it or not. It is in the blood of every Arab without choice. He tries to run away from it, but all the roads lead to it. It is in the blood, in the very depth of our souls, with our will and against our will even without knowing.

Believe me, I know that the murderer goes to hell and that the murderer receives his punishment on earth and in the hereafter. However, although I am sure about this, I definitely know only one answer to the one who asks me: For how much do you sell your mother--that is, to kill him immediately. Let hell and suffering be my reward. Let me lose my blood drop by drop. Let them kill me, crush me, tear me to pieces, hang me in the largest square. But I know no other answer to the one who asks me the same question than to kill him immediately. [applause]

How could the sons of Egypt belittle their own country, with everyone trying to tear it apart and dig into its flesh? How is the mother who fed us her milk and her flesh and who gave us love, science, wisdom and affection to be repaid? We are getting bigger and she is gradually getting weaker, so we must give her our flesh, blood youth and money.

Most regrettably, it has reached a point where the mother who took her dress off to cover her son and protect him from the cold, who neglected herself to give warmth to her child because this is her goal and this is what gives her real warmth [incomplete sentence as heard].

Oh stray sons of Egypt who have fled from your mother's embrace, how much have you sold your mother for, your mother who bared herself to cover you and who went hungry in order to feed you and kept awake so that you might sleep? And for what in this mortal world? If it is for principles, then there are those in her lap who are struggling with principles who might triumph or lose and who might also die, but they do so in her lap and on her soil. [applause]

Is it position that you seek, plan for and dream about all your lives? I assure you that the simple peasant in your country is happier than you in your expatriation and loss. Even if he dies of starvation, it would still be quite an honor for him to die while cultivating his land and trying to give life and the people something with his own work, instead of begging or seeking something for himself only.

Arab Egypt is everlasting and eternal. It is the mother, spirit and life through you. It might doze or be shaken for a moment, but it will always be Egypt. Egypt has never abandoned its Arabism nor have the other Arabs abandoned Egypt. All brothers differ, fight and then reconcile. All roads will ultimately lead to this sole spring. [cheers and applause]

This is the problem of democracy and opposition in Egypt. The opposition party has formed and carried out all its actions, which you have been following in their paper--the Labor Party paper. I will deposit all the paper's editions with the assembly. I will not confiscate them nor will I ban the party as the experts have been telling them. We have been strong and confident enough in the past 10 years because God Almighty declared to the entire world that he is with us. The remaining members of the centers of power slept in their houses yesterday. [applause] We are strong. The National Democratic Party, which represents the people of Egypt, is very strong, as the people of Egypt are. It is strong [applause] outside. The centers of power left yesterday, although each of them had still 10 years to serve in prison. They spent 10 years and some were sentenced to death. They all left. We are strong and Egypt is strong and consequently the people of Egypt are strong and the NDP is strong. We want a strong opposition party. [applause] We want an opposition party that would not listen to Egypt's being slandered --from outside. We want an opposition party whose opposition would win the respect of the people because it is an objective opposition.

We want an opposition that would tackle the core of the problems of the people and would talk objectively. It is really comic that it should be said that the tunnel has been completed and that they should say it was not necessary and why all these expenses. Can the linkage of Sinai with the Nile Valley be so simply dismissed as unnecessary? What is this?

As for the Qattarah depression project, it is said that this project is wrong. Oh my God. For a person to say a word in this regard, he needs to consult engineering establishments and he must be an expert. When we decided to implement the Qattarah project, we consulted the Germans. And when they stopped their work, we brought in the Swedes. The scientific standard of the Swedes is famous. It is one of the highest standards in the world. We brought in famous engineering and expertise establishments.

The opposition dismissed the project in few words: They said it was not necessary. It was an opposition for the sake of opposition. This is not an opposition but rancor, and a continuation of the line that we rose against on 23 July. Why did we rise on 23 July? This line made every politician in Egypt lose the respect of the people, who also lost respect for the words of the politicians. The only salvation of Egypt was the fact that after the Cairo fire we did not permit the dogs to come out to tear it to pieces and slay its people in a civil war. As armed forces, we assumed the responsibility for the people. [applause]

However, the most overbearing could not say in giving vent to their hatred anything regarding the 23 July revolution other than it was a coup that was supported by the people. The most hypocritic and ungrateful people could say nothing else. No, there was a revolution. It was a revolution with two aspects. The first was a political aspect and the second a social aspect, exactly like the French Revolution.

The French Revolution suffered more than three setbacks. The empire was restored twice after the establishment of the republic; the titles were restored. The titles of count, baron and others are still in existence. However, the simple French citizen had been liberated since the start of the French Revolution.

In the recent presidential campaign, you saw the president of the republic, Giscard d'Estaing, and his rival, Mitterrand, going to the smallest Frenchman to persuade him and receive his vote. For the count and the baron, who owned the land and all there was on it before the revolution, must now go to the smallest peasant and beg for his vote in order to be elected to the French parliament. The French citizen has occupied his place, the same thing applies to the 23 July revolution.

All of you have heard about the driver from Damru with whom I spent one night. You have read about him. When I met him again, this peasant from Damru, after 37 years, I asked him: Where are your sons. He told me: The first is a doctor practicing in Banha, the second has a B.A. in agriculture and the third is on a scholarship in the United States. Was this possible under their excellencies the pashas and their lackeys? [applause] Was this possible for an Egyptian? There can never be a retreat from this. They have attained their rights.

I spoke to you about Mit Abu al-Kawm. At one time, my brothers and I were the only ones who attended school there. Today, there are medicine, engineering, science, police, army and law colleges--all college branches are now found there. There is not one child in Mit Abu al-Kawm who does not receive a higher education in one of these colleges.

I carried out research to find out the conditions of these children. We built a new club and other premises for them in Mit Abu al-Kawm. Mit Abu al-Kawm is not an exception. The proof is what the peasant or driver from Damru said. When I was his guest 37 years ago, he had only one hall and the toilet faced it. The coal brazier and the oven and other things were in the yard. One of his sons is a doctor now, the other has a B.A. in agriculture and the third is on a scholarship in the United States studying fine arts. His daughters are educated too.

This is what the 23 July revolution has accomplished. The 23 July revolution is exactly like the French Revolution. The hated ones and their lackeys have no right at all to contemplate a return backward. Never! Not even if they were to sneak their men back in, as they did at the Lawyers Union, and say: What is happening? It never happened in the history of the people that the workers and peasants had a 50-percent representation. This was a trial balloon. This has ended. You can now see how the Egyptian peasant and driver have fared. The people of Egypt now have their representatives and rulers.

Well, how far have we come with democracy. We have reached the present stage. I give advice to those who want to work in politics. I tell them that the era of working in politics with the deficiency of the Wafd Party and the incomplete independence by which they deceived Egypt is over. The leaders deceived Egypt more than the British and the king did. This era is over. Those who want to work in politics must analyze things and ask: What is our present historical stage? It is the stage of the beginning of the comprehensive renaissance. Independence began on 23 July. There have been no British or a king in Egypt since 23 July. The mistakes that have been committed since then have been our mistakes, we the Egyptians. The king, the British and foreign colonialism ended on the morning of 23 July.

Well, as I said at the start, I neither retreat nor do I hide the facts. As a revolution, I am responsible for every decision adopted by the 23 July revolution. I say this in full responsibility in order that you all may bear witness. I want you all as witnesses. I do not say this to gain credit. No, I am responsible for every decision that has been adopted since 23 July and until I hand over the trust to the person who will come after me.

On this occasion, I greatly admire 'Uthman, who right after your session yesterday came to me and insisted on resigning and devoting his time to the popular development in the party. [applause] I was angry because of 'Abd an-Nasir's sons. 'Uthman told me: I felt that you were angry. I said: Of course, I am angry because of 'Abd an-Nasir's sons. They are my sons. It is true that nothing direct or indirect has harmed them. Why? In our actions in our country, we respect the feelings of every human being, because a human being in Egypt is my responsibility from the most remote hamlets to the most remote cities in the north, south, east and west. [applause] However, I want you to know what 'Uthman told me. He said: I did not know that there was a misunderstanding. I waited until the assembly made matters clear and I came to tell you. I told him: There has actually been a misunderstanding. However, I want to tell you that even this misunderstanding regarding the sons of 'Abd an-Nasir is a sensitive matter to me.

It is a misunderstanding from a distance not only because it involves the sons of 'Abd an-Nasir, but because they are a bigger responsibility. You know my values and morals as a village man. You have the same values and morals except for the groups, which you know. I say and repeat that anyone who wants to work in politics should ask, what is this era? It is the era of renaissance.

Independence was established 23 July. There are no British or a king or foreign interference here. Unfortunately for these groups, I was a witness to this era. I announced the beginning of the 1959 revolution in my own voice. This was almost 30 years ago. The question of independence is over. What are we doing now.

This is the era of renaissance and of rebuilding. It is not the past era of complete independence or violent death. No, it is an era of intensified agriculture, a high standard of living and prosperity, exactly like the battles that you have been between Giscard and Mitterrand in France.

What was their debate about? It was about unemployment, the economic standard and taxes. This was the battle between Giscard and Mitterrand, which only ended a few days ago.

Why? For years I have been hoarsely shouting, the question of complete independence and violent death has been settled and has been over since 23 July. We have attained complete independence and removed the king, the British and the corruption of the old parties, which still have their residues.

Well, I got tired of telling these groups that political action and political exercise now revolve around building prosperity for the Egyptian man. How? It is by producing more, achieving a better economic standard and giving opportunities to every youth to build with his sweat. This is sound democratic practice. This was what the battle was about between Strauss and Schmidt in Germany and between Carter and Reagan. All of you know that economic policy was the basis of the battle between Carter and Reagan. This is why Reagan concentrates on economic policy now. Democratic practice throughout the democratic civilized world is the building of prosperity for man and how to provide guarantees for man.

The remaining residues of the past still believe that democratic practice is complete independence and violent death. They believe that if they come and make two speeches here at the assembly and then carry out a maneuver or tell a lie, they might pass unnoticed.

No, regrettably it is completely clear that under the name of democratic protection, they are trying to undermine democracy. All of us are supposed to protect and defend democracy.

No, what these elements are doing now is protecting themselves under the guise of democracy because they know that I have closed the detention camps. Some might tell me that they are afraid but are not ashamed. This is true. Had the detention camps still been open, they would have thought five times before acting. However, it is not necessary to reopen the detention camps. Everyone will be brought to his senses by democracy and by the law, and the country will get all its dues from him.

Why do I feel reassured? I feel reassured that your party, the party of the majority, is, thanks be to God, strong and a giant by the will of the people of Egypt. Therefore, we will take our time, study and participate in the formation of a strong opposition befitting our current stage. We want a strong opposition like the majority party, but we want it liberated from the vestiges of the past.

I excuse the corrupt, whom I saw are less than 20 in Egypt, when they talk about a courteous opposition. They create complexes for the people when they speak of a courteous opposition. To prove that this is not a courteous opposition, this group deviated from all values and wrote whatever it wanted. This is democracy. I told you my opinion about it. I will send you the research, God willing, which is necessary for the formation of the opposition. We will read the history of democracy, the formation of the parties and the establishment of the opposition and consolidate our deeds, but we will never stop. We will continue along our path.

The second battle is that of building peace. I have spoken about the building of democracy. I am sorry if I have spoken long. However, it was necessary to describe our vision of how democracy should be built in the future. In the future, we must build a strong opposition as we have built the majority party. These are our objectives regarding democracy in the coming stage, God willing.

The second process is peace. As you can see, for the sake of peace, I was compelled to launch the October war. On 16 October while the battle was raging, I came to this platform to deliver a speech. During the peak of our victories, I delivered a speech and said that I did not want war for war's sake. During the peak of our victories on 16 October, I delivered a speech in which I said that I did not want war for war's sake. [I told the Israelis] leave my land and the Arab land and come and sit down with us to establish peace. Al-Asad sent me a message asking how I could say such a thing without consulting him. It was a disgraceful thing for him to do this.

We launched war for the sake of peace. In 1977, I undertook my initiative. I am indebted to our people and to you in this assembly for this support, this understanding and this awareness.

In 1977, there was a small incident, which I must also mention. I should have mentioned this incident during my discourse about democracy because those cowardly elements are also unabashed. Some still say that the 18 and 19 January 1977 incidents were a popular upheaval. You of course know that it was an upheaval of thieves. Again they exploited democracy because there were no detention camps. They knew that we would not reopen the detention camps. I didn't even form a special tribunal. They were referred to the Supreme Court.

In the same year, I undertook the 1977 initiative. I am not afraid of those bad elements who are here in this hall. As long as they are obsessed with grudges, there is no use in talking with them. Do as I do. I do not waste my time with those who are obsessed with grudges.

If the entire county was against me at the beginning of 1977, then how did I manage to undertake my initiative in visiting Jerusalem in November? If the country was really against me, I would have needed 3 or 4 years to repair the situation. None of these cowardly and unabashed elements, who number only 20 among a population of 41 million people, has any awareness.

I undertook the peace initiative. I am indebted to Egypt--my people, country and kinfolk--and to you for this. Afterward, as you know, we signed the Camp David agreements and then the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. In 9 months, Israel evacuated 80 percent of Sinai up to a line extending from Al-'Arish to Ra's Muhammad.

The peace process has now been temporarily suspended for two reasons, the first being the U.S. elections. Reagan was elected in these elections. It was necessary for him to take a breather to prepare himself to join us in the peace process. His secretary of state, Haig, came, met with me, saw the area and returned.

The second reason was that immediately after the election of the new U.S. President, it was announced that Israel had advanced the date of the elections from November to June this year. Therefore, we are waiting for the Israeli elections.

However, let us again discuss the peace process. After we signed the Camp David agreements in 1978, the Arabs turned the world upside down against us. They met in Baghdad. My daughter 'Azzah is right. It is not only fugitive journalists abroad who have sold their mother, but also some elements from our people here whom we all know. When they write articles attacking their country under the umbrella of democracy--they are not defending democracy but are seeking its protection--some grudging elements, especially in Kuwait, copy these articles to slander Egypt.

In 1978, after the Camp David accords, the Arabs met in Baghdad. [They decided] to boycott, besiege and starve Egypt and they [accused] Egypt of treason and so on and so forth.

Okay. I have something to say to the opposition. I want to ask a question: Is the cancellation of sequestrations a national or party action? At that time we had not yet formed a party. I canceled the sequestration in the name of Egypt.

Okay. Are ensuring freedoms in 1971, closing the detention camps, enacting the constitution, ensuring the sovereignty of law and the return of judiciary, national or party actions? [shouts in the background "national"] Is the October war a national or party action? [applause] Is the reopening of the Suez Canal a national or party action? Is the abrogation of the treaty with Russia in 1976, after it broke Article 8 of the treaty, a national or party action? Is the peace initiative a national or party action? [applause]

Okay. I will tell a simple story. Writers and mongers of politics of the spiteful group, who number 20 out of 41 million people, asked: How can we abandon the Arabs? How can we abandon our Arab responsibility? They said that we must return to the Arabs. We must do this and that. The Arabs are so and so.

After that we knew they went to a country where not only we were abused, but where the people also reject Al-Asad--his own people reject him. For 2 years a revolution has been going on there. He shells Aleppo with tanks and artillery, exactly as he is doing in Zahlah and other helpless cities. They went to tell him to abuse Egypt and its rulers. As you know, they were preaching this.

Okay. They were also urging that we return to the Arab nation and Arab solidarity. This simply means that I hand over the fate of Egypt and the Arab nation to Hafiz al-Asad, al-Qadhdhafi, Saddam Husayn and some spiteful people in Kuwait. You know that the PDRY, which sent someone to kill the YAR leader, was forgiven. Shall I leave the fate of Egypt and the Arab nation in the hands of such people, just to return to the Arabs?

I will assume a simple thing. You remember when I was addressing you in this place the Arabs were meeting in Baghdad. They sent a delegation to me saying: We decided to give you $5.5 billion annually if you come with us. It was a warning: Either I go or they will ruin me and Egypt. It was a warning to starve us. You remember this as I was with you here.

I welcomed them here in Egypt, but I said that no Egyptian official would meet with them--and no one did. I want to assume this: If I had accepted the $5.5 billion annually--I assume this although, as you know, that peace to us has another significance: One single drop of blood of any of my soldiers or officers to me outweighs the $5.5 billion one hundred times. This is the basis. [applause]

However, I want to assume that Egypt had tried to agree with them on Arab solidarity. I assume that I had agreed to their offer. If I had agreed, what would have happened to me now, after what has happened to Iraq, which was supposed to give me $1 billion annually, while it is now begging for $1 billion every month. What would my situation have been? And what about Al-Qadhdhafi, who was supposed to give $1 billion, although he never honored one of his commitments? He did not even honor his commitments to the PLO. Yasir 'Arafat is listening to me now, and he, himself, Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf] and all of them told me about what happened. They told me about what Al-Qadhdhafi did to them before our rupture of relations. Al-Qadhdhafi will not change. He has never honored his word.

What would our situation have been now? I would have sold out the blood of my sons and would not have received the price they promised, although it is worth nothing. I am saying this for the mongers of politics who raise the question of Arab solidarity, and who do not know what the Arabs are. I am saying this to the opposition, who call themselves opposition even though it is shameful for them to do so. To say they are spiteful, yes; to say they are, with their henchmen, a minority party, yes. But to describe themselves as an opposition, no! This is shameful.

What is their view of the current Arab situation? What is their view of Al-Asad, who is shelling helpless cities after shelling Tall Az-Za'tar with its Palestinian women, children and old men? They are scared of him, but they are not ashamed. They are terrified of him.

I want to tell you something. In the peace process we expressed our view and I will repeat it here before you: The Palestinians must take their issue in their own hands, as the Algerian National Liberation Front [FLN] did. The FLN formed a provisional government and took its issue in its own hand. All of us used to help Algeria but from the beginning the owners of the issue had it in their own hands. They formed a provisional government and the entire world laughed at them. It was this provisional government, under Ben Khidda, which sat with France in Switzerland and got the independence of Algeria after the world had laughed at it.

Did we tell the Palestinians anything other than this? We tell the Palestinians the same thing: Take your issue in your own hands. Do not keep saying that you are afraid of Al-Asad because he is geographically controlling you or that you are afraid of so and so. Take your issue in your own hands. This is what I am saying. Form a provisional government. A day will come when Israel will sit down with you. However, I say the following: Al-'Arish, the capital of Arab and Egyptian Sinai, is open. Anyone who has an issue with Israel, let him come and I will bring him Israel to speak with him there in Al-'Arish.

Why? Just as we have done, I was not prepared to give my issue to Al-Asad, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, the PDRY president, Saddam Husayn or to any of the rancorous rulers, who are not acceptable in their own countries, in order to tackle my destiny. No. I tell the Palestinians the same thing: Take your issue in your own hands and we will all help you as we helped Algeria. Come to Egypt and sit in Al-'Arish with Israel, with whom you have an issue--or are you waiting for the Soviet Union to sit with Israel in your place? There is no other solution: Either you take your issue in your own hands or let the Soviet Union do as it usually does, namely, exploit the issue for itself.

In relation to the Lebanese issue, I am sad about the news I heard; not for anything but only because the Syrian people, through Al-Asad's adventures, are heading for a fate known only to God.

We have our view on this, so let us be clear to Al-Asad and Syria. As I said in 1975 and in 1976: Oh Al-Asad and oh Israel: Hands off Lebanon, and let the Lebanese Army advance to fill the vacuum after Syria's departure in order to put an end to Israel's pretexts. If the Lebanese Army is not efficient enough, let a UN emergency force be formed until the Lebanese Army is formed in order to take over. Lebanon will then remain for the Lebanese. Oh Syria and oh Israel: Take your hands off Lebanon. This is our view on the Lebanese issue. [applause]

In relation to the peace issue, we waited for two elections; one of them has taken place and the second, the Israeli elections, will take place in June--then we will begin the peace process.

After 2 years and after the Baghdad conference, when they said that they would isolate and starve Egypt--yes, truly, I want to ask: When one comes out and says I will starve Egypt and we resist him, are we nationalist or partisan? When one unashamedly says: I will starve Egypt, will defending Egypt be nationalist or partisan? This is a matter that calls for shame.

Like democracy, what is the future of the peace process? What is in the future concerning the peace process is that we did not sign a separate agreement with Israel. The only reality that has remained after 2 years of Arab fragmentation and division and all that is taking place in all parts of the Arab nation is Egypt, with its stability, security and peace. [applause] Then let those who say democracy and who seek protection in democracy stop saying that they are protecting and defending it. Let them stop because Egypt alone in this area--not in the Arab nation only but in the entire Middle East--is the stronghold of peace, security, democracy and the dignity of man. We are not concerned with whether the Arabs recognize this or not.

The only fact that has remained after they had made such a stir is the peace agreement between Egypt and Israel, because it is as solid as steel. This agreement is the way to a comprehensive peace, which is our goal, and not a separate agreement, as some are propagating or as it pleases them to say. This concerns the peace process.

In the next phase Egypt will continue to work for the completion of the peace process on all fronts because, as I said myself in the Knesset, unless the Palestine problem is solved--even if Israel managed to achieve peace with all sides without settling the Israeli [as heard] issue--there can be no peace. This is Egypt's opinion. I said it in the Knesset and I said it later on and as I repeat it again and again, and I will repeat it a hundred times. This is Egypt's line, its Arab responsibility and its Islamic responsibility.

That was about the peace process. There remains the third of our battles, which is the promotion of prosperity. With it I will conclude. God Almighty has chosen to bless our work and put his hand in ours.

As I have told you, in 1972 I spent a week looking for $1 million. In 1975, however, we got the first $200 million in revenue from the canal in 6 months. We reopened the canal in June. By the end of the year we had $200 million. This meant an annual revenue of $400 million. This progressively increased in the years that followed.

In 1975 we were impotting oil. Why? Because we had not opened our oilfields since the days of the battle. After the second disengagement agreement we got some of our oil back and we opened our oil wells. In 1976 and in 1977 our products became sufficient for our own needs, which total about 13 million tons a year. After 1977 we began having an oil surplus, and began exporting it.

As I have said, in 1972 I spent a whole week trying to find $1 million. In 1973, you heard, I convened the National Security Council on 5 Ramadan, that is, 5 days before the battle. The members are all alive. Some of them are here--Sayyid, Mamduh, Hatim. Fu'ad, you also were with us. In 1973, 5 days before the battle, I convened the National Security Council.

I told them that our economy was below zero, below zero, and you have heard me say that this meant that I did not have the loaf of bread for 1974.

Why? Because I was buying bread on credit. When I do not pay the creditors they do not give. I had no funds to repay, and I was at the point where I would not even find a loaf of bread. However, thank God, the battle broke out. I received the first $500 million from the Arabs when the battle broke out and when they believed that the battle was on. They waited 6 days to see what would happen. They found us scoring victories every day. Anyway, we then regained the canal. As I said to you, we then got the oil.

Then came 18 and 19 January 1977. The Arabs moved and said that 18 and 19 January were a catastrophe for the Arab nation and we must all stand with As-Sadat and support Egypt, that the people were suffering and this is why we must support [Egypt].

Great. At the same time Italy had the same problem we had, that is, they had an economic crisis. In Europe, what did Schmidt of Germany do to help Italy during its 1977 crisis, the same year we had our difficulty? He wrote a check for $2 billion and sent it to the Italian prime minister, who in turn cashed the check and managed his affairs and later repaid it.

Well, the Arabs would not do that. They said, we will give Egypt $2 billion. I said fine. This was on 18 and 19 January. When did they pay, Mamduh--at the end of the year?

[Salim speaking] (They said) they would finance the development projects. At the time we needed to balance our balance of payments and we needed liquidity in order to settle the remaining short-term debts.

[As-Sadat, continuing] It was as Mamduh says. Observe what Schmidt did for Italy. He signed a check for $2 billion and sent it to the Italian prime minister to solve his problem, and the money was repaid. We, however, continued to negotiate, as Mamduh said, until the summer. They said: Get the IMF to guarantee you. We said alright. We did. Then they said: The IMF guarantee is not enough, we need another world bank. So we looked until we found the Morgan Stanley Bank which agreed to guarantee us. So we had the IMF and the Morgan Stanley Bank guarantees. The summer passed and the fall came.

Mamduh told me that every day our debts increased by 70,000 pounds sterling. If we paid our debts the increase would have stopped. This sum was a new debt in itself of 70,000 pounds sterling every day. I sent them a message saying it was shameful because we had been negotiating the sum for 10 years. Italy paid off $1 billion because it took the $2 billion on time. Soon afterwards, Italy paid off its debts while we had done nothing.

Some 10 months passed before they began to pay, and for what? For projects. Why? Those thoughtless people whose offices are run by Egyptians in the field of economy, and other fields, wanted to see the projects before paying. Anyway, they paid $2 billion. We took it in the second half of the next year. That is, we were supposed to take the money in the first year, but we took it in the second half of the next year. We understood then that the sum would be renewed when it was spent, that is, the $2 billion would be renewed. But they said no. You have $2 billion and that is all. They said: If you want to borrow money, we will help you borrow it. That is, we will find you lenders.

But we were unable to borrow from any country. That is what made me disgusted in those days. I swore by God that it was easier for me to mortgage the Suez Canal or anything else than to deal with those insignificant and backward people, who imagine that money was everything. No, Egypt was greater than all this. [applause]

When I say this, the opposition, or rather, those who call themselves the opposition, do not understand it. They said: No, As-Sadat wanted to mortgage Egypt. But can I do anything without bringing it to your assembly here for discussion?

This is a constitutional matter. When I do such a thing, I would be convinced and say it before you and our people. I would borrow from any man in the world, even from Satan, provided that he would not humiliate us.

Those people are war profiteers and have the oil mentality, and the like. No man can accept this. They said that $2 billion was too much. They said you took $2 billion, that is enough, and if you want to borrow more we will find you lenders. Regrettably, these are the Arab brothers. This is the talk of those who call themselves the opposition. Anyone who wants to use the term opposition must understand the dimensions of the term. Things must not be taken so simply.

After 1977 our oil production began to increase. In 1977 we received Al-'Arish-Ra's Muhammad and the oil quantities in the area. After that, God Almighty responded to my prayer. In 1972--no, in 1973--I prayed to my God that I would not enter Moscow again under any circumstances. My prayer was answered and I triumphed in the war. [applause]

During our latest battle in Camp David, the peace treaty and peace talks, I prayed to God to stand by Egypt. It did not occur to me at all that things would happen in this way. I say that this was a result of God's satisfaction and one of his miracles, that we are proceeding on the path that God loves and accepts. All of them stood against us and all of them were waiting for the moment when we would be forced to beg money from them. Why? Because they thought that our people's demands are great, and, since we are 42 million, increasing by 1 million annually, and our resources are limited, in order to build we need huge sums. As capital was accumulating in their coffers, they thought that we would be forced to come to them. I prayed to God for Egypt, not for myself. Why? Because I know myself. [applause] No matter what happens, by God I swear that even if I should die from starvation my head will remain raised high with Egypt. God's will prevailed while the Arabs circulated rumors that the army would move in Egypt and that everything was over. Before the Mecca incident a report went from Saudi Arabia to the Arab leaders that the Egyptian Army would take action and that As-Sadat would last only 2 or 3 months. At another time they said he would come and would kneel to get money, because he was building the country and could not meet Egypt's demand.

They adopted resolutions to starve Egypt and blockade Egypt, and so on and so forth.

Then came last year and the will of the richest of all, who, when he chooses, gives without limit, prevailed. True, we had suffered, and I tell you, by God, that even if we had nothing I would have asked the people that we fast and deprive ourselves until God's salvation came, rather than humble ourselves to those people, because those are insignificant people. I cannot describe them. Furthermore, God Almighty has always been with Egypt. I always said that God would never let us down. I had, the first time, prayed to God Almighty that I would never have to go to Moscow and, thank God, I triumphed in October, despite them.

The second time, it was as if God were telling the whole world: I bless your steps, Egypt, so here is oil. Oil began to flow and I found 500 million pounds two months ago 'Abd ar-Razzaq 'Abd al-Majid came to me and whispered in my ear that we have 500 million pounds, so let us give it to the people. [applause] Fine, 'Abd ar-Razzaq. Two years later [as heard] Hilal whispered in my ear. Today our oil revenues amount to about 2 billion pounds. After 3 years this will increase to 12 billion. [applause]

Where is this coming from? It is God's great blessing. However, if we had not deserved it and if we had not stood on our feet, worked hard and faced difficulties and trouble, our reward from God would not have been so generous and so great.

Today we thank God. I used to dream about $4 billion from them annually for about 5, 6 or 10 years to turn Egypt into a paradise. Today, it is not $4 billion but more, and it is all our own. I used to invite them to come and participate with me here, as in the case of the pipeline. I have told the story of the Suez-Alexandria pipeline. When I wanted to build it, Faysal, may God bless his soul, told me: Anwar, this is simple. Here, take $400 million, use it and pay us back later. We would be sending oil through Egypt and this would pay for the money.

I said to him: No, I want you in it with me. Well, for your information, Faysal, Kuwait and Qatar joined in with me. Today they are getting 30 percent profit. No other project in the world gives 30 percent, and it is guaranteed--the pipeline, like the pound.

I thank God. I had wanted them to contribute $4 billion a year so that they would have co-ownership with me in agriculture and everything I was going to do, as my partners, and so that their money, instead of being merely banknotes in the bank, would be turned into farms and production forever, and they would get their money and still be partners with me. Thank God, we will do it ourselves. We are not in need. [We have] more than they dream. Observe God's wisdom. The situation has been reversed. Kuwait [as heard] is borrowing one billion every month and Libya borrows from Kuwait two billion--and Egypt says: May God forgive you. [applause]

Well, how will the building of prosperity be achieved? We have embarked on the battle of challenge. All the stupid claims and attempts to engage us in secondary battles must end. We have embarked on the battle of great challenge. The Arab contractors are now working on 50,000 feddans of land for cultivation. The land is not being reclaimed but cultivated. This area includes an agricultural-industrial complex and a city. This is being done this year. When we succeed in this, next year we will embark on the cultivation of 100,000 feddans, God willing, and build two cities, and so forth. We will thus solve the problems of food, housing and supply from the wide door. Therefore, my total attention in the coming period will be devoted to the 50,000 feddans. I shall sit there, even if I have to set up a tent, so that by the end of the year I can get the production of 50,000 feddans with new agricultural technology and modern science. We are not experimenting with this. We are doing it. This process has been going on in As-Salihiyah for the past 3 years.

The second thing with regard to prosperity to which I will devote my time this year will be the stabilization of prices. The stabilization of prices requires two things to be done. The first thing is being done by the popular development in the party, which is the responsibility of 'Uthman. This is to remove the middlemen so that a kilogram of beans will not be bought from the field for 8 piasters and then sold in Cairo for 80 piasters--from 8 to 80 piasters.

An enormous system will be introduced and operated by 'Uthman and the new minister, Ash-Shirbini--we brought him from abroad, from Switzerland, for the operation. This system is not enough. The second thing for the stabilization of prices will be the production of the 50,000 feddans, which will totally change market economics. For this reason I told you not to be surprised if I took a tent and sat in the middle of the 50,000 feddans and worked with the children in order to produce.

I am sorry if I have spoken for too long, but I had to deliver my message to you on this historic day. Our children and grandchildren will talk about our celebration of the 10th anniversary, in which God Almighty sought to support us and bless our efforts.

As always, I pledge to you that we will continue to shoulder the responsibility with honor, responsibility and ethics. We call on every one who wants to work in the political field to shoulder the responsibility with us, whether as supporter or opposer, with honor, responsibility and ethics. We promise to remain true to the people's confidence in us. We hope you and my brother and sister members of the NDP will continue to work in this sacred mission, with God's help, in the spirit of honor, responsibility and ethics. May God grant you success. God's peace and blessings be upon you. [applause]

ARMED FORCES GENERAL COMMAND COMMUNIQUE 342

JN201659 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1625 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Baghdad, 20 May (INA)--The Iraqi forces have destroyed a large Iranian ship in Khowr-e Musa, in the north of the Arab Gulf, while it was on its way to the port of Bandar-e Shahpur. A communique issued by the Armed Forces General Command today said that two enemy helicopters were downed in the southern sector of the battlefield. It added that the other Iranian losses were 46 dead, 2 armored personnel carriers, 1 field gun, 1 vehicle, 2 excavators, 3 obesrvation posts and 4 ammunition stockpiles. The text of the communique follows:

Communique No 342 issued by the Armed Forces General Command:

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate. Our victorious armed forces continued to hit the forces of the Magian Persian enemy in the operations sectors yesterday evening and today. The results are as follows:

I. Known enemy losses:

A. Two were killed opposite our positions in the Nowsud region.
B. Three were killed and one armored personnel carrier, one field gun and one observation post were destroyed in the Sar-e Pol-e Zahab region.
C. Six were killed in the Gilan-e Gharb region.
D. Two were killed in the Mimak region opposite our units' positions in Sayf Sa'd.
E. Nine were killed in the Mehran region.
F. Five were killed and one ammunition stockpile was destroyed in the Dezful region. An intact excavator left by the enemy in no man's land was removed by our forces.
G. Three were killed in the Shush region.
H. Two observation posts and one ammunition stockpile were destroyed in the Khafajiyah [Susangerd] region.
I. Three were killed in the Ahvaz region.
J. Our units hit enemy concentrations and positions in the Abadan region, killing 13 and destroying 1 armored personnel carrier, 1 vehicle, 1 excavator and 2 ammunition stockpiles.
K. Two enemy helicopters were downed in the southern sector of the battlefield today.
L. At noon today, our forces hit and destroyed a large enemy ship in Khowr-e Musa, in the north of the Arab Gulf, while on its way to the port of Bandar-e Shahpur.

Thus, total known enemy losses amount to 46 dead, 2 armored personnel carriers, 1 field gun, 1 vehicle, 2 excavators, 3 observation posts, 4 ammunition stockpiles, 2 helicopters and 1 large ship.

II. Our losses:

A. In personnel: Three martyrs in all sectors.
B. In equipment: One mortar, one field gun and one rocket launcher were damaged.

[Signed] The Armed Forces General Command, 20 May 1981

PRESIDENT SUPPORTS SOUTH AFRICAN SANCTIONS

JN201533 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1445 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Paris, 20 May (INA)--President Saddam Husayn has stressed that the Iraqi Government and people stand by the side of the African peoples for the sake of obtaining their freedom and independence. This was contained in a message President Saddam Husayn sent to the conference in charge of imposing sanctions against the South African regime. This conference is currently being held at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris.

He added that Iraq is greatly impressed by the results of the conference because these results will help to support a just cause that is unanimously recognized by the world through adopting effective measures against the regime which oppresses millions of African citizens who are struggling for their freedom and human dignity.

The president pointed out that Iraq firmly advocates the freedom of these peoples and gives this subject special importance stemming from the Arab nation's experience of struggle against a racist regime which is no less fierce than that of South Africa, namely, the Zionist entity, which is oppressing the Arab people in Palestine and robbing them of their inalienable rights and is applying the same racist methods to which the African citizens are subjugated under the yoke of the racist regime of Pretoria.

The president also pointed out that the two racist regimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv are working along one axis, supported by the imperialist and colonialist forces, in order to consecrate their illegitimate occupation of the African and Arab territories and to perpetuate their racist rule, especially since their military and nuclear cooperation is further promoted day after day.

The president concluded his message by saying that Iraq has adopted all necessary measures in the field of imposing a complete boycott against the regime of South Africa. Iraq, he added, is observing this subject with exactness, particularly in the field of oil. He further said that a world boycott can tighten the siege against this regime and can bring about its inevitable end. The message has been considered a document and was filed among the conference documents after it had been distributed among all participants.

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED ON UGANDAN OFFICIAL'S VISIT

JN201724 Baghdad INA in English 1545 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Baghdad, 20 May (INA)--Iraq and Uganda have vigorously condemned the racist Zionist aggression against the Arab people and south Lebanon which is an imperialist manoeuvre aimed at liquidating the Palestinian resistance.

In a joint communique issued today at the end of a visit to Iraq by Ugandan vice president, Mr Paulo Muwanga, the two countries stressed that a just and lasting peace in the Arab region cannot be achieved without full and unconditional withdrawal of Zionist forces from all the occupied Arab territories, the Palestinian people regaining their full rights and the establishment of an independent Palestine.

The two sides reviewed the present international situation and stressed their belief in the principles of the United Nations Organization, the Nonaligned Movement and Islamic Conference Organization and said, respecting these principles is a necessary factor for the preservation of international peace and security, and for the progress and welfare of all peoples.

Iraq and Uganda emphasized the necessity to boost Afro-Arab cooperation taking into consideration the historical ties that bind the African and Arab peoples together. Both countries condemned the apartheid regime in South Africa for its blatant violation of human rights and its occupation of Namibia and reaffirmed determination to work jointly with international organizations for the elimination of all forms of racism and the liberation of all illegally occupied territories. Iraq and Uganda noted with satisfaction the development of relations between the two countries and resolved to expand the scope of cooperation between them. The Iraqi side appreciated Uganda's current difficulties and the efforts exerted by the government to reconstruct and rehabilitate the country. The Ugandan side appreciated Iraq's positive response to the initiatives of the Islamic Conference Organization, the Nonaligned Movement and the United Nations aimed at resolving the conflict with Iran through negotiations in order to ensure security and stability in the region.

KING HUSAYN TO VISIT SOVIET UNION IN LATE MAY

LD202118 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Moscow, 20 May (TASS)--The king of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Husayn ibn Talal, will pay an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union late in May at the invitation of the President of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

KING HUSAYN RETURNS FROM SEVEN-NATION TOUR

JN201458 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1430 GMT 20 May 81

[Excerpts] Amman, 20 May (PETRA)--His Majesty King Husayn returned home this afternoon at the end of a 5-day Arab tour during which he visited Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, the UAE and Oman. The tour aimed at crystallizing a unified Arab stand in the face of the foreign challenges and dangers against the Arab nation.

His majesty the king held talks with the leaders of these states on the developments in the Arab homeland and the new international events and their impact on Arab causes. His majesty's delegation, which included Prime Minister Mudar Badran, Royal Hashemite Court Chief Ahmad al-Lawzi, Court Minister 'Amir Khammash and Foreign Minister Marwan al-Qasim, also returned home with his majesty the king.

This morning, His Majesty King Husayn held a second meeting with His Majesty Sultan Qabus Ibn Sa'id of Oman in Muscat. During this meeting, His Majesty King Husayn reviewed the results of his talks with the heads of the Arab Gulf states. The two leaders also reviewed their two countries' stands toward the current events and developments on both the Arab and international levels.

AL-QASIM DISCUSSES WAR, ARMS, SYRIAN RELATIONS

LD180737 London AL-MAJALLAH in Arabic 16-22 May 81 pp 21, 22

[Interview given to Huda al-Murr by Foreign Minister Marwan al-Qasim in Amman--date not given]

[Text] Amman--[Question] It is being said that America is exerting pressure on Jordan to make it join the Camp David process or similar process?

[Answer] Formidable pressures were exerted on Jordan 3 years ago. However, Jordan believes in real peace for itself and the area. Now, after 3 years, we discover that the proposals that were made in this regard were not based on the required foundation. Consequently, Jordan's stance became stronger after it became certain that the process must incorporate the basis of peace and the principles and conditions of peace. The principles that have been approved must be emphasized, proceeding from the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the Security Council and the Baghdad summit conference. It must also be emphasized that the Palestinian issue is a pan-Arab cause and there must be pan-Arab commitment to it. No side whatsoever has the right to achieve a unilateral solution to the Palestinian issue. A decision at the Arab level must be made on the process of peace when peace proposals are made.

[Question] It has been said that you are seriously thinking of purchasing arms from the Soviet Union. Certain people have interpreted this move as Jordanian pressure on the United States. How true is this?

[Answer] We believe in the necessity of diversifying sources of arms. What we are now witnessing in the area confirms the Jordanian view. We have our own armament plans. We have American, British and French arms.

[Question] Then Soviet arms are lacking?

[Answer] The army has Soviet arms, although not in large quantities. Nevertheless, Soviet arms exist. We do not need to acquire arms from the Soviet Union just so that it can be said that we have begun to approach the Soviet Union. We have other needs. If these needs can be found in the Soviet Union, there is no objection to discussing them and then asking for them. If they do not have what we need, we will buy somewhere else.

[Question] It is being reiterated that mediation efforts are being made to restore normality between Jordan and Syria.

[Answer] The reasons for the bad relations between us and Syria are now clear to the Arab citizens and the Arab rulers. We were always surprised when it was said that Jordan had a hand in the attempts to bolster the Muslim Brotherhood. Naturally, this is completely untrue. This matter was raised at foreign-minister level before the recent summit conference was convened. Everybody regarded it as a flimsy and groundless reason. As to the accusation that we have joined the Camp David process, Jordan has been a key factor in aborting the Camp David process. After becoming sure that what we have done was right, why should Jordan participate in a failed process? We again say: We must not doubt each other. This is not in the interest of Jordan, Syria or the entire Arab nation. If there are other matters, let us talk frankly and honestly. If there are internal problems, there is no need to level accusations haphazardly without any real reason.

[Question] Why are they accusing Jordan specifically and not any other Arab country?

[Answer] In the past we used to say: We have heard or read in some newspapers accusations that we are training the Muslim Brotherhood. Syria's response was: "The fact is that you are not the ones who were meant: The saboteurs are training elsewhere. But they cross Jordan in order to come to us." The accusations were not leveled at us directly.

[Question] Why were the accusations later leveled directly?

[Answer] Whenever they said that there were Muslim Brotherhood members in Jordan, we told them: "You know this country very well. There is no need to give us a week's notice. Come here any day you like and show us the training centers. We are prepared to take you any place you wish, or you can use your planes to scout any area you like."

[Question] What was the result?

[Answer] The enmity between the two countries resulted after the eruption of the conflict between Iran and Iraq and our support for Iraq in its ordeal. This stance made Syria somewhat apprehensive since it made it believe that we were forming an axis and allying with Iraq against it. However, this belief is unfounded. We act on the basis of complete Arab unity and solidarity and we never involve ourselves in bilateral Arab conflicts.

[Question] Are there no signs on the horizon of Arab mediation to settle these disputes?

[Answer] Good gestures emanate from real self-appraisal. We welcome any mediation at any time on conditions that there is a sincere desire to deal with one another on a clear basis founded on national and pan-Arab commitments. The objective is not to split the Arab world and to polarize it but rather to strengthen this nation. In the past we used to say that Syria's strength is a strength for Jordan and we meant what we said 100 percent. The opposite should also be true, that is Jordan's strength is a strength for Syria.

It should not be that if Jordan becomes strong it will become a danger to any Arab country of if Syria becomes strong it becomes a danger to any Arab country. On the contrary, we believe that there are no conspiracies in one Arab country against another Arab country but rather there is one single conspiracy against the whole Arab nation.

[Question] How are your relations with the PLO?

[Answer] Our relations with the PLO are based on clear and constructive principles. The PLO is quite aware that it shoulders great responsibilities. We believe that the PLO must play its natural role in the peace process in its capacity as representative of the Palestinian Arab people.

[Question] Several Arab quarters have asked for the opening of the Jordanian front in order to ease the pressure on southern Lebanon. What are the obstacles to pursuing this course?

[Answer] If we review our history in the past three wars we find that we Arabs have given Israel the opportunity to advance on the military front. If we now take such action we would open a door for Israel which it has for long been trying to open and we would be giving it a new justification to pounce on new Arab territories whether in southern Lebanon or in any other place in the Arab territories. But now there is no requirement to open a front in order to ease the pressure on southern Lebanon.

[Question] What is required?

[Answer] What is required now is that the battle with Israel be economic, political, cultural and, finally, military. In order to achieve victory, operations should be coordinated on all levels and basic resources should be available in order to be utilized in this fateful battle. Otherwise we will continue to pursue the same course. Every 10 years we will give Israel the opportunity to bite off a new piece of Arab territory. This is what Israel wants, particularly since all the Zionist communities in the world are mobilized to stand on its side.

[Question] Do you expect an Arab-Israeli war?

[Answer] The fact is that the Arab world will not be able to achieve a positive result if it goes to war at this particular time. This is because of the deteriorating Arab situation. We cannot--in fact we should not--give Israel any justification for war, particularly since entering into an actual war with it would lead us to defeat. Therefore, we in this country are quite aware of this danger which Israel will try to exploit. Of course, southern Lebanon or the whole of Lebanon is considered by Israel to be a situation providing a good opportunity. For this reason I say that by not giving Israel a justification we are saving Arab territories which Israel will try to swallow. Emphasis should be placed on the presence of UN forces and on increasing their number because they will be directly concerned and will be responsible before the Security Council and the major powers and, therefore, they can stop the aggressor.

[Question] What about the Arab Deterrent Forces [ADF]? Will they withdraw from Lebanon?

[Answer] We have heard on more than on occasion that the Syrians want to withdraw from Lebanon. But they demand sure guarantees that Israel will not penetrate Lebanese territories. Such a step can be achieved only by the UN forces.

SARKIS, SHAM'UN DISCUSS HABIB MISSION, TUNIS PARLEY

NC201928 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] At 1700 today, President Ilyas Sarkis received [former] President Camille Sham'un in the presence of Foreign Minister Fu'ad Butrus. After the 30-minute meeting, Sham'un said: The meeting was exploratory, and the subjects discussed are known. They are, first, the mission of U.S. Envoy Philip Habib and the point it has reached. There are reassuring cables on the outcome of this mission and others less reassuring. The second subject was the Arab foreign ministers conference in Tunis. We wanted to learn the news from His Excellency President Sarkis about this conference, which will be devoted to the crisis between Syria and Israel over the missiles in Al-Biqa'.

He said: The dispute must be resolved through understanding to avoid a battle on Lebanese territory.

In reply to a question, Sham'un said: I raised with President Sakria the queation of the indiscriminate shelling of residential quarters.

INTERNAL SECURITY COUNCIL MEETS UNDER AL-WAZZAN

NC202020 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan, in his capacity as interior minister, convened the Internal Security Council at his residence in Al-Basta at 1630 today. The discussion during the meeting dealt with the security situation and the measures necessary to tackle these developments.

The meeting was attended by Staff Maj Gen Ahmad al-Haj, the director general of the Internal Security Forces; Brig Gen Sami al-Khatib, the Arab Deterrent Forces [ADF] commander; Samih as-Sulh, the director general of the Interior Ministry; Camille Ja'ja', the public prosecutor at the Court of Causation; Staff Brig Gen Nabil Quraytim, the secretary general of the Higher Defense Council; Brig Gen 'Abbas Hamdan, of the army command; Brig Gen Sami Tabbrarah, commander of the Beirut police; Hafiz Shahadah, from the Directorate General of Public Security; and Brig Gen Shawqi Sha'rani, adviser of the interior minister.

Prime Minister al-Wazzan said: The meeting was held in the wake of the recent deterioration and indiscriminate shelling, which undermined everyone's morale as well as as caused material damage.

The prime minister said: After reviewing the situation and listening to the views of the representatives of the responsible departments in the Internal Security Council, agreement was reached on measures that must be put into effect soon after contacts are made with the parties concerned. He added that these measures, in their basic approach, were advocated by the Cabinet, which unanimously decided on the need to go ahead with them out of the belief that the Lebanese must be the first to be interested in restoring security and stability. The years of war have proven that violence does not solve any problem but rather complicates them and creates new ones, which will remain a burden on the Lebanese and the homeland for many years.

Prime Minister al-Wazzan said: The council considers itself in permanent session to follow up these measures. I formed a working team consisting of the commander of the Internal Security Forces, the ADF commander and a representative of the army command. This team will be in contact with the political authority to carry out the measures we noted. They must be translated into deeds as soon as possible given the nature of the security situation and need for calm and stability.

He added: We take this opportunity to appeal to all the forces to abide by the cease-fire of heavy weapons in residential quarters and against residential quarters, especially since all the casualties are innocent people, including children and old people. Concluding his statement, the prime minister said: What is happening cannot be condoned, even among the enemies, and even more among brothers in the same homeland. We all agree that we must eventually proceed to reconciliation, the only alternative to the continuation of death and destruction.

CABINET MEETS 20 MAY, DISCUSSES EFFECTS OF SHELLING

NC201412 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1300 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] At 1145 today, President Ilyas Sarkis presided over a Cabinet meeting in the presence of Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan and the other ministers. The meeting continued until 1340, after which 'Umar Musaykah, the secretary general of the prime minister's office, gave the following official information:

The Cabinet devoted most of its session to tackling the tragic situation caused by the indiscriminate shelling in all areas, which is resulting in huge losses among innocent people. The Cabinet noted the authority's efforts, which have been continuing day and night, to stop the deterioration in the security situation. It also discussed at length the proposals that will end such practices and adopted political and security measures with a view to stabilizing the daily security situation for the citizens and activating the reconciliation process. The Cabinet then discussed the topic of Lebanon's participation in the Arab foreign ministers conference, scheduled to be held in Tunis, and decided to form the Lebanese delegation to the conference under Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates Fu'ad Butrus. The delegation will include Husayn al-'Abdallah, 'Abd ar-Rahman as-Sulh, Nasir Salhab and Samir Mubarak.

Replying to a question on the indiscriminate shelling of innocent citizens and residential quarters, Prime Minister al-Wazzan said: The case is a big one and not new, as Lebanon has been suffering this tragedy for years. Whether the shelling is extensive or minor, we absolutely reject it. The Lebanese have had enough tragedies that have destroyed their nerves and all their interests. At our Cabinet meetings, we feel these tragedies and tackled them with all possible good intentions, capabilities and solid will in order to continue all that is beneficial in this regard. Today in particular, the Cabinet discussed, among other things, this situation and adopted some measures that I submitted to it in my capacity as interior minister, particularly the measures I intend to take through the Internal Security Council, which I convened yesterday to tackle this important question.

Alleged Cabinet Division Denied

NC210633 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0530 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] The Cabinet has been unanimous over various subjects discussed. Information Minister Michel Iddih last night expressed regret over reports released by a certain news agency concerning an alleged division among the ministers' stands regarding the question of conciliation and other subjects discussed by the Cabinet. The information minister confirmed that there was complete harmony on various subjects and that these reports were fabricated and unfounded.

VOL SAYS ADF WITHDRAWS FROM BEIRUT POSITIONS

NC201802 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1715 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Some Arab Deterrent Forces [ADF] positions in western Beirut were evacuated today. The Palestine Liberation Army occupied these positions. It has been learned that the positions from which the ADF withdrew included the Caracas traffic circle and a position near (Al-Fakhuri) pharmacy in Ar-Rawshah. Palestinian military reinforcements were seen on the Beirut airport road, where antiaircraft gun positions were set up. Other positions were set up in the sports city for heavy and long-range artillery. This is in addition to the establishment of military fortifications.

AL-ASAD SAYS SYRIA IN 'DEFENSIVE POSITION'

JN210608 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] Yesterday His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad received the representatives of the U.S. ABC, NBC and CBS television networks and answered their questions:

Question: On Tuesday evening, the Israeli prime minister stated that no war would break out between Syria and Israel if Syria does not begin the attack. Do you think this statement is an introduction to a peaceful solution to the current crisis in Lebanon?

Answer: We cannot link this statement to what has happened and is happening in Lebanon. We do not want to discuss internal events in Lebanon with Israel because Lebanon is an independent and sovereign state. We discuss domestic affairs in Lebanon with the Lebanese sides and the legitimate authority in Lebanon. Contrary to the impression intended by the question, Israel's involvement in the Lebanese problem increases its complexity and prevents a possible solution.

Question: Were Philip Habib's proposals for a negotiated settlement acceptable to the Syrian Government? Did these proposals open new horizons for a peaceful solution?

Answer: Our meetings with Philip Habib to date deal more with general discussion than with specific discussions. When Philip speaks about what we can term specific points, he is conveying Israeli demands to us, rather than putting forth proposals in his name or on behalf of the U.S. administration. This is what has been happening thus far.

Question: In your opinion, Mr President, has Philip Habib's mission contributed to the finding of a peaceful solution? Have the possibilities of war receded as a result of his mission?

Answer: Actually, up to this moment it is difficult to foretell anything about this subject, for it is hard to read the Israeli intentions, although indications show aggressive intentions, as evidenced by the Israeli Air Force attack on Syrian helicopters which were transporting food supplies for our military positions and also as evidenced by its attack on our ground forces in Lebanon. All this took place on a day when there was no fighting in Lebanon and when we had begun contacts, in cooperation with the legitimate authority in Lebanon, to achieve accord among the disputing Lebanese parties. This confirms the following conclusions: Through its intervention Israel wishes to prevent accord among the beligerents in Lebanon. It does not want Lebanon--this independent country--to regain its serenity and it does not want its sons to have a normal life in their country.

Question: I know it is hard to predict, however, is there any good in Philip Habib' mission? Is there any good in its continuation?

Answer: We welcomed Mr Habib and we do not wish to have war break out in this region at this stage. However, as you know, our stand in Syria and Lebanon is a defensive one. Philip Habib knows this. We thank him for his efforts and we wish him success in curbing Israel and preventing it from continuing its aggression against Lebanon--the independent and sovereign state--and against the legitimate Arab Deterrent Forces [ADF] which are present in Lebanon upon the request of the legitimate Lebanese authorities and in accordance with an Arab League decision. Naturally, we wouldn't be objective if we were to make a judgment now on Philip Habib's mission--whether it will succeed or fail. We must wait.

Question: If the current conflict continued, do you think that it might develop into a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union?

Answer: I do not think it is my job to answer on behalf of the Soviet Union or the United States. The answer to this question should come from the United States and the Soviet Union. Naturally, neither we nor anyone else wants a clash to occur between the Soviet Union and the United States, the two big powers in this world.

Question: What is the nature of the support which Syria has recieved from the Soviet Union during this conflict?

Answer: The Soviet Union supports us against aggression. It is convinced that aggression is being committed against us. For this reason it supports us, aids us politically and supplies us. This is no secret. It supplies us with the arms necessary for our armed forces. We are in Lebanon to stop the civil war in Lebanon. This is what we have done and this is what was agreed upon 5 years ago between us, Lebanon and the Arab governments. Our forces have been in Lebanon for 5 years. They did not go to Lebanon to attack Israel from there. When we want to attack Israel, there are common lines between us, that is between us and Israel. There is no need to go to Lebanon to attack Israel. The world and Israel know this. While we were carrying out our legal and legitimate tasks in Lebanon, we were attacked by Israel. Furthermore, it wants to impose its hegemony over Lebanon, subjugate us in Syria and subjugate the Arab nation to its will. It wants to violate Lebanese airspace unchecked and strike at those on Lebanese soil whenever it wants, without allowing those on Lebanese soil-Lebanese, Palestinians and Syrians--to defend themselves.

The Soviet Union and many other world states which are objectively following the situation in the region and fairly know these facts, in light of them, are adopting a just stand in our support.

Question: Mr President, do you feel that the United States is active in an attempt to escalate the tension in the Middle East? I am basing my question on your remarks a few days ago in which you said that there is a Zionist-imperialist onslaught.

Answer: Successive U.S. administrations talk about human rights, freedom and world peace. At the same time they supply Israel with the best U.S. technology, which is, the best in the world, in large quantities to give Israel superiority over all the Arabs put together. If we take into account Israel's rules of thinking and its expansionist trend, we can explain Israel's recurrent onslaughts against the Arab homeland. It is said that these U.S. arms are given to Israel for self-defense. However, Israel has not used these arms, not even once, except outside its border. It is always using these arms outside its border: In Lebanon, Syria and formerly Jordan. This is what it is doing now.

We did not attack Israel. We in Syria and Lebanon are two fraternal countries which have been cooperating for ages. We are one people. And now Israel comes to interfere in Lebanon and say: You can do this and you can't do that. Israel also says that it wants to be sovereign in Lebanon's skies and that neither Syria nor any other Arab country is entitled to enter Lebanon's skies. Such unprecedented Israeli arrogance, haughtiness and aggression would not have been possible without U.S. support. Thus, taking into consideration U.S. arms supplies to and support for Israel, the United States can and should curb Israel. Otherwise, the U.S. stand cannot be considered positive on the issue of peace in the region and issue of peace in the current crisis. I mean that if the United States does not curb Israel and put a stop to Israeli aggression, it would be difficult to see the U.S. stand as positive.

Concerning talk about human rights, how can this be in line with Israel's continuous and barbaric shelling of the Palestinian camps and villages in Lebanon? We must all remember that those Palestinians were expelled from their homes 33 years ago and have been dispersed in several Arab and world states over since. They are living in tents and even the minimum necessary requirements for a respectable living are not avalable for them.

Israel, however, is not satisfied with all this. It is even pursuing them in their camps in Lebanon, where it strikes at them, killing their children, women and old people. It is using the planes and arms supplied by the United States to do all this.

Is this in keeping with human rights and with statements saying that these arms are given to Israel only for self-defense? No Arab citizen believes that what Israel is doing with U.S. arms is in accordance with the Americans' desires and aspirations for freedom, a slogan they upheld a long time ago and for which they offered many sacrifices.

Question: Reports say that there is a 4-point U.S. plan to solve the current crisis. My question is made up of two parts: First, has this plan been proposed to you and second, would Syria be ready to gradually withdraw its missiles if Israel agrees to limit its reconnaissance flights?

Answer: Actually, a specific plan like that spoken of by some media circles in the region has not been proposed to us. Concerning the solution formula or proposals pertaining to Lebanon's territory, airspace and waters, we believe that everything pertaining to Lebanon is the responsibility of the legitimate authorities and the disputing sides in Lebanon.

In Lebanon there is a legitimate government which enjoys the confidence of the Chamber of Deputies. It is this government alone which has the right to discuss what is going on in Lebanon's territory and airspace and decide what is permissible in Lebanon's territory and skies. Indeed, any other concept would be contrary to the laws of modern life and the rights of peoples to own their resources and have sovereignty over their territories. No state in the world would allow its airspace to be open to everyone. Thus, how can Lebanon allow Israel to freely use its airspace? We know that Lebanon is in a state of war with Israel and a truce has been established for years. I do not know of any world state which has allowed or would allow any other state to control its airspace.

Question: Does Syria have any other conditions for withdrawing its missiles from Al-Biqa' valley other than the condition that Lebanon must request this?

Answer: This is not a matter of conditions. It is a matter of necessity. We have to provide our soldier, who is legitimately present in Lebanon or any part of Syria with whatever is necessary for self-defense.

We have not installed these missiles for years because we did not need them. We only installed these missiles when Israel directly attacked us. These missiles are defensive and not offensive. They do not strike at targets in Israel. They are ground-to-air missiles and only strike at a plane seeking to attack our forces.

The matter is one of need. It has nothing to do with conditions or other sides. I wonder, would Israel agree if we told it, for instance, to withdraw its missiles and units from Galilee. The population there is Arab, but it is within the State of Israel now. I would also like to ask: Does Israel have the right to dictate its conditions to us in Lebanon and to Lebanon itself? For instance, does the United States, which is a superpower, have the right to dictate similar conditions to any other neighbor state? I do not think that any state has the right to impose such conditions on any other state, whether it is a neighbor state or not.

Let us keep Syria out of the discussion now. Israel wants to violate Lebanese airspace unchecked. Would Israel allow Lebanon to violate its airspace? Lebanon has an air force. Would Israel allow the Lebanese air force to do what it likes in Israeli air space?

Question: What are your comments on the decision made by some of your allies to stop financial aid to the ADF? Can Syria alone bear the costs of this force for any reasonable period of time?

Answer: This matter is not essential now and has not been essential in the past. Arab financial aid is more token aid than real aid. When we consider this matter to be essential, we can take it up with our Arab brothers. This is not a major problem. It is just a question of about $10 million; and, as you can see, this is not a big sum. Whether the Arabs contribute to financing the ADF or not, to this is immaterial. The Syrian forces have a legitimate status there. We in Syria can bear the costs. At any rate, even with the Arab aid, we bear 90 percent of the supply costs, and, of course, 100 percent of the other costs relating to the presence of the ADF. I would like to repeat that the continuation or noncontinuation of the aid is not a major problem. Still, I know that when the matter becomes of political significance, our Arab brothers will be with us and resume the financing. If we are in need, they will provide the funds.

Question: Let us again pause at the previous questions, especially regarding your reference to political significance. Can we assume that the lack of financial aid to the ADF is an indication that the other Arab states will not give you the support you expect in the case of a conflict with Israel?

Answer: Such an assumption is unrealistic. No matter how the Arabs differ among themselves, they will stand together when the matter concerns Israel. This is a well-known fact. You have read all statements and learned about some of the contacts that took place among the Arab brothers. The Arab stands are against Israel without any hesitation. They cannot but be so. In any conflict between an Arab country and Israel, the Arabs will be one rank, because Israel is an aggressor with hostile aims against all Arabs, not just a single Arab country. Israel is not just against the Palestinians, Syrians or Jordanians, but against all Arabs.

As you know, we are one nation with a common past, future and destiny. Therefore, we must support one another, and stand by our army, in face of dangers. At any rate, even with regard to the ADF, if this is important, our Arab brothers have told us that they have not stopped [lam yuqifu] financing the ADF. Saudi Arabia has informed us that it has not stopped financing the ADF. Kuwait has also informed us that it has withdrawn its reservations concerning the ADF. As a matter of fact, we have not been officially informed that the Arab states have stopped their aid.

Question: The main question raised by Americans is will war break out between Syria and Israel? We have already asked this question at the beginning of the interview, but permit me to repeat it and ask: Are the chances of a peaceful solution now better than they were 2 weeks ago?

Answer: The matter concerns Israel. It is not in our plans to attack Israel. We were not the first to create tension in the area. It was Israel that attacked. Still, we have no plans to attack Israel. As far as we are concerned, there will be no war, but if the matter concerns Israel and its intentions, then the answer to the question should be obtained from Israel.

We are in Lebanon to stop the civil war there. Our presence is a legitimate one. We are tackling Lebanon's issues through cooperation with the Lebanese parties and the legitimate authority in Lebanon. The arms we send to Lebanon are essential for internal security in Lebanon on the one hand and for defending ourselves against any possible Israeli attacks on the other, including the missiles which Israel is talking about. They are surface-to-air missiles. They are defensive, not offensive, missiles. They only hit aircraft which come to attack us. In short, I would like to say that we do not intend to attack Israel. We are in a defensive position. If Israel attacks us, then we will strongly defend ourselves. This is the natural right of every people. This is the position.

It is important here to address U.S. public opinion and the U.S. citizen and say: The U.S. weapons and funds given to Israel are used for expansion and aggression against the Arab countries and Arab citizens. This, we believe, is against U.S. citizen's convictions and wishes.

The proof of what I said, that Israel is using this aid for expansion and aggression, is what is happening now. We are in a defensive position and Israel wants to attack us and impose its conditions on Lebanon and Syria, contrary to all rules, logic and international norms. In such a situation, we have to strongly defend ourselves and our rights.

DAMASCUS CLAIMS VICTORY IN PRESENT CRISIS

JN201432 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 20 May 81

[Station commentary]

[Text] The talk about a crisis that might push the region to the precipice of war, the bragging and aggressive statements and threats and the very insolence of such talk were all the causes rather than the consequences of the crisis. Through fabricating the so-called missile crisis, the Zionist enemy tried to propagate the belief that Syria's obstinacy and haughtiness are pushing the region into a war, thus making it necessary for this enemy to launch an attack.

The enemy thought that the Arabs would only adopt the role of spectators to events, thus inadvertently bolstering the enemy's scheme and stand, and demand that--or even force--Syria to hesitate, withdraw and retract its stand, which Syria cannot do. Indeed, for Syria and its masses the issue is greater than the evils of war, feelings of apprehension or any price that might be paid. The issue is one of dignity, and Syria cannot agree to retract or be capable of retracting its stand when the issue of dignity is at stake.

Our Arab people from the ocean to the Gulf stood alongside Syria since these people were aware that Syria is waging their battle and is being subjected to threats only because it is defending their issue and upholding and protecting their message. However, the enemy's plan failed. Syria neither retracted its stand nor yielded to threats. Nor did the Arabs fail Syria or hesitate to announce their support for Syria's firm, principled pan-Arab stand. The enemy, however, is aware that today's Syria is stronger and firmer than it was yesterday, even though the isolationists flocked to the side of the enemy and its masters--the imperialists--and As-Sadat became involved in the schemes of this enemy and its masters.

It was this awareness which forced the enemy to reconsider its calculations and reap the thorns it sowed. This enemy had fabricated a crisis which was intended to be a test for Syria but this very crisis turned out to be a test for this enemy itself, its aggressive policy and schemes. This test turned out to be a failure. It shook the foundations of the enemy's policy and schemes and contributed further evidence of the failure of the capitulatory solution adopted by the defeatist and colluding Egyptian ruler Anwar as-Sadat and the enemy. This test also proved the danger of wagering on the enemy and its aggressive nature as a means by which some sides in Lebanon can settle their accounts with Syria, which has always adopted a firm and courageous stand, sought to maintain the unity of Lebanon's territory and people and insisted on following a pan-Arab course where the Arab issue is concerned.

The fabricated missile crisis, which was intended to be a crisis for Syria, Lebanon and all the Arabs, was transformed into a crisis for the enemy and those dealing with this enemy. In fact, this fabricated crisis could only have been transformed into a crisis for the enemy. The enemy's demand that the missiles be withdrawn was an overexaggerated, impudent and supercilious demand. Such a demand was intended to be tantamount to a war without arms, a war from which Syria, and behind it all the Arabs, would emerge defeated and would thus pave the way for liquidating the Arab issue. Instead, Syria broke the barrier of fear and confronted the enemy. Thus, Syria achieved victory for the Arabs and the issue with the support of the Arabs and the issue.

LEBANESE CRISIS SAID TO REVIVE PAN-ARAB FEELING

JN201415 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1315 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Damascus, 20 May (SANA)--The political editor of the newspaper AL-BA'TH asserted today that the steadfastness of Damascus and its ability to make political and military decisions have achieved a qualitative development in the confrontation of the U.S.-Israeli challenge. These aspects have foiled the U.S.-Israeli attempts to use the worsening Arab situation to their advantage and, accordingly, to direct a quick strike at Syria, especially since their attempts to shake Syria from the inside have failed.

In addition to that, the editor added, the U.S. attempts to probe the effectiveness of the Syrian-Soviet friendship agreement under the circumstances of a threatening comprehensive war have also failed.

The political editor explained that the Syrian stance has also proved the falsehood of the concept that Camp David is a fit framework for the settlement and that it is impossible to wage a war without Egypt. The AL-BA'TH political editor added: The stance of Damascus has created new Arab situations because this stance has actually activated and revived the pan-Arab feeling, which has been suffering from frustration and despair. He pointed out that the Syrian stance has caused obvious confusion to the U.S. move in the region and has reduced the intensive U.S. onslaught.

The AL-BA'TH political editor emphasized that apart from all this, Syria has managed to lead the situation in Lebanon toward the course of national accord after having crushed the illusions of the isolationist forces. Moreover, Syria has succeeded in blocking all paths to the powers that are acting in the direction of dividing Lebanon. The status quo which Syria has created makes it impossible for these powers to proceed one step forward in the direction of dividing Lebanon.

TISHRIN SEES UNITY AS ARAB CONFERENCE GOAL

JN210831 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0445 GMT 21 May 81

[From the press review]

[Text] In its "Behind the News" column under the headline of "Arab Syria and the Test", the paper TISHRIN says: It is no secret that Al-Asad's Syria is exercising its firm and principled policy against the enemy and every aggression, provocation and challenge by this enemy. Nor is it a secret that Syria proceeded from this policy when it decided on its stand.

While being firmly committed to defending the nation's dignity and rights to confronting its enemies, Syria is certain that its stand is a necessary and sincere Arab stand supported by all the Arabs. However, the crystallization of such support in formulas that are in keeping with events as well as with the new developments in the arena of the Arab-Israeli conflict--and Syria has become the only knight in this arena--undoubtedly necessitates convening an Arab meeting on a responsible level in order to reach decisions that measure up to these developments, particularly in the midst of this ominous and decisive atmosphere.

TISHRIN adds: Syria has always called for mobilizing all the nation's potential in the battle. However, Syria did not make this call a condition for continuing along the path of struggle. Indeed, it has always affirmed that it would remain in the arena even if it should be alone, since such is the fate it had accepted and to which it had dedicated itself. Thus, proceeding from this solid stand and decision and Syria's exercising of such a stand, Syria has welcomed and is welcoming all Arab support and has urged and is urging all Arab brothers to take their positions in the battle and exercise their role in the joint struggle for the common cause.

The convocation of the Arab foreign ministers should now be geared toward one major goal, namely, determining stands and roles in such a way that these stands and roles would be in line with the stage and events and meets the nation's needs and struggle requirements in its confrontation of the enemies and these enemies' great challenges.

What our nation is facing today is graver, more vicious and more important than all that it has faced throughout all the stages of confrontation with Zionism and colonialism. Our nation is facing a big and difficult test and Syria's head, which they want, represents the Arab spearhead which they want to eliminate in order to rearrange this part of the world enabling Israel to continue its aggression and expansionist presence.

The Arabs are aware of all this. In fact, all this has been exposed to all the world. It is also known how the Arabs should face this test: They have to go through it as one unified nation. Their weapon should be strong Syria and its heroic people.

The paper concludes: The Arab foreign ministers are called on to measure up to the battle being imposed on the Arab nation by Zionism and imperialism. They are also called on to lay down the necessary bases for bolstering Syria's steadfastness in the battle of confrontation, which it is waging against the enemy on the behalf of all the Arabs.

PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY SPEAKER MEETS SOVIET AMBASSADOR

JN201304 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1300 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Damascus, 20 May (SANA)--Mahmud Hadid, People's Assembly speaker, received here at noon today the Soviet ambassador in Damascus. They discussed the situation in the area and Israel's new practices supported by U.S. imperialism to prevent the achievement of the accord in Lebanon. Hadid explained that Syria would constitute an impregnable barrier in the face of all the plots that are being hatched against it and against the Arab nation's aspirations and interests.

Hadid and the ambassador discussed the arrangements pertaining to the visit of the People's Assembly delegation led by the assembly speaker to the Soviet Union during the first half of June.

ROMANIAN JUSTICE MINISTER ARRIVES 18 MAY

JN182009 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1915 GMT 18 May 81

[Text] Damascus--Romanian Justice Minister Ioan Ceterchi arrived in Damascus this evening leading judicial and legal delegation on a 1-week visit to Syria.

The delegation will hold talks with the Syrian Ministry of Justice officials to develop judicial cooperation between the two countries.

JERUSALEM: SYRIA'S POSITION 'SOFTENING'

TA201416 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1400 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] It transpires from a briefing given by the prime minister to Agudat Yisra'el Knesset members that there is a certain softening in Syria's position on the Lebanese crisis. The change in Damascus' position occurred following the recent round of talks conducted there by U.S. Envoy Philip Habib.

BEGIN GIVES PRESS CONFERENCE AFTER HABIB TALKS

TA201701 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1636 GMT 20 May 81

[Excerpts] Good evening. This is the editorial room of the IDF Newsreel. We are now switching over to the prime minister's office, to our political correspondent Gad Becker.

[Begin, in English] So it's the usual. I will start with a declaration in Hebrew, then a few questions will be asked, put to me in the same language and then I'll make a short statement in English and again a few questions, but only a few because I have a man waiting for me.

[Begin, in Hebrew] Ladies and gentlemen, we have again had an important and good talk with Mr Philip Habib and with his advisers, and what can be said in conclusion on this talk is that the efforts to reach a solution in a peaceful way are continuing. But, since I have never misled you and never will mislead you, I personally can say that it is not clear today whether the results will be positive--especially in view of Mr al-Asad's statement to journalists in Damascus. He said that he had not received any American suggestions, merely Israeli demands. This is definitely not true, but this is what he said. Hence, I can't tell you whether I am pessimistic or optimistic; I can't simply issue any statement on this subject today. Mr Philip Habib is staying in Israel for the time being. He may leave again for Beirut as well as for Damascus and he, of course, always does his job in the best manner possible; we shall discuss the situation with the Cabinet at the regular Sunday meeting. After that session I may again have something to tell you.

[Question] Mr Prime Minister, you are saying that in view of what the Syrian president told the journalists you cannot be optimistic. Is there reason to believe, from talks the Syrian president has had with Philip Habib not in front of microphones, that a diplomatic settlement may still be possible, that a withdrawal of the missiles is still possible?

[Answer] Allow me to correct you. I did not say that I cannot be optimistic. I said I couldn't tell you whether I am optimistic or pessimistic, simply because I do not know. In my view, this statement of Al-Asad's is most extreme. First of all, it is not true. Mr Habib, in point of fact, did bring Al-Asad U.S. proposals. It is simply not true. But its contents are very extreme and this points to the direction. But you are asking me whether President al-Asad of Syria is able to make a statement in private, which would differ from a public statement. This is possible. But we shall learn about it later.

[Question] And to date, such is not the case?

[Answer] No.

[Question] Mr Prime Minister, would you say, on the basis of the reports you heard yesterday, and in view of President al-Asad's declaration today, that there has been a turn for the worse?

[Answer] I am not sure that yesterday's situation was different.

Al-Asad, for example, in his talk with Philip Habib, was often silent. He said nothing negative, nor anything positive. That may be a good sign--or it may not. What is clear is that this statement, that these are the Israeli demands, that the United States identifies with Israel, and the like--this statement cannot make us optimistic that a peaceful solution is imminent. It may come, but we must be patient. Our scenario for you is as follows: Let me conduct the Cabinet session next Sunday and I promise you that after that session I, and not the government secretary, will make a statement. That is a promise.

[Question] Mr Begin, in the event that Syria absolutely refuses to accept proposals or to accede to Mr Habib's ideas, will you recommend to the Cabinet that diplomatic efforts be continued?

[Answer] We shall continue with diplomatic efforts as long as there is even an iota of hope that they will lead to a peaceful solution.

[Question] Sir, to this stage, has Saudi Arabia's contribution to the contacts underway to resolve the crisis been positive or not?

[Answer] The Saudis are trying to help. It was just 2 days ago that I made a very sharp statement about the Saudis and about their regime, and I do not retract even one word of what I said. But in these contacts the Saudis are trying to help. The truth must always be told. That does not change my mind about their regime, or about their attitude toward us, or about the supply of AWACS planes or about other such matters. But in the past 24 hours, they have tried to help.

[Question] How do you explain this, given their hostile stand toward Israel?

[Answer] Well, I think they need not always look at the Israeli problem; perhaps they see the Syrian problem. We are not a problem at this time; someone else has a problem. We are patient, cautious, balanced, we are not running anywhere, we are not hastening anywhere. So perhaps Riyadh is thinking about other problems and not about our problem, which does not exist. Of course, we have a topic to discuss and make a decision on. But the problem is perhaps in fact that of the other side.

[Question] Do you have any meetings planned with Mr Habib before Sunday?

[Answer] There is no meeting planned, but we will be in telephone contact. If something comes up, we shall certainly meet again.

[Question] Does the Israeli demand that the situation be restored to the status quo ante still exist, or has there been any change?

[Answer] There has been absolutely no change, neither on Israel's part nor on that of the United States regarding the necessity of restoring the status quo ante. On this matter there is full agreement between the United States and the Israeli Government.

[Gad Becker] Well, then, according to the prime minister, the situation is once again very unclear. The prospects for a political solution or for some other way out are not clear. In the meantime, back to the studio.

More on Begin Remarks

TA201853 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 20 May 81

[Excerpts] Speaking to reporters after meeting with American Envoy Philip Habib in Jerusalem, Begin said Israel agrees that Habib should continue his efforts.

The prime minister said Israel has not set a time limit for the negotiations. As for the present situation, Israel and the United States were in full agreement that the status quo ante must be restored in Lebanon. He denied reports that the United States has asked Israel to restrict its flights over Lebanon, saying they would continue over all of that country. He said it was necessary for Israel's national security. On Saudi Arabia's role, Begin said in the last 24 hours Riyadh had tried to help by making proposals and private statements. The prime minister made it clear that Israel has no intention to attack Syrian forces. He disclosed that in one incident Israeli units had accidently attacked the Syrians. Israel took the initiative and indirectly informed the Syrians at the time that the attack was unintentional.

PERES MEETS WITH HABIB; BRIEFED BY BEGIN

TA211018 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1000 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] Head of the opposition Shim'on Peres expressed his belief that U.S. Envoy Philip Habib will for the time being remain in Israel to receive Syria's replies on the missile affair. Peres conferred with Habib this morning and later he heard a report from the prime minister on the situation, in his capacity of member of the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee.

Peres told our correspondent David Essing that, in his opinion, the situation continues to be serious. The head of the opposition favors the government's position that the status quo ante should be restored, including the resumption of the air force's flights [over Lebanon]. Nevertheless, Peres believes that harsh declarations by the parties do not help in settling the crisis.

SHAMIR, EBAN, DAYAN DISCUSS DEBATE, LEBANON

TA202040 [Editorial Report] Jerusalem Domestic Television Service in Hebrew at 1935 GMT on 20 May carries a 35-minute panel discussion on the weekly Moqed program with Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir, MK Abba Eban and MK Moshe Dayan participating. Eli Nisan is the moderator.

The show began with the moderator asking whether there should be a public debate on issues of vital security. Shamir replied that the public "should show restraint and refrain from debates on any move or step liable to aid the enemy." Eban took issue with this, saying that the existence of a debate "is inevitable and even healthy," although it all depends on the level of the debate. Dayan's position was that he "totally objects to any public debate on operational issues or on political matters which should not be and are not allowed to be made in public."

Asked about Labor Party Chairman Peres' suggestion that formal contacts be held with the opposition, the foreign minister said he agreed with the notion in principle, but went on to reiterate the prime minister's stand that the matter would come up at the next Cabinet session. Shamir refused to divulge his own position. Eban said that Peres' idea could "foster a consensual atmosphere," while Dayan expressed his general agreement with the suggestion. Both Eban and Dayan accused the government, and specifically the prime minister, of making public operational details. Dayan reiterated his own Knesset remarks to the effect that the Knesset debate on Lebanon should have been held after the prime minister had met with Philip Habib, not before.

Asked about a price that Israel might have to pay in Lebanon, Shamir said: "I do not see anything on which Israel has to make a concession in this confrontation with Syria." Shamir went on to reiterate the government's position that the situation must be restored to the status quo ante, adding: "Israel has opposed and will oppose a total Syrian takeover of Lebanon and the terrorist organizations' takeover of parts of Lebanon. Such a takeover would very seriously affect our security."

Shamir said that "Syria has now violated the rules of the game" by introducing missiles. Israel, he said, welcomes diplomatic efforts to resolve the situation.

Eban said Israel must continue to have "total freedom to combat the terrorists and freedom to collect intelligence information by aerial means." He added that Israel should make Habib's job easier bu not indulging in unnecessary rhetoric or by hinting at deadlines. Dayan said that "it is obligatory to expand the settlement regarding Lebanon, but I do not think this is within our capability." He said the main problem was Lebanon's "loss of its sovereignty," and that as long as this was not resolved, "a crisis situation would continue to exist in Lebanon." Dayan said he "would not place a time limit" on the present negotiations, "even if I know that as more time elapses, the Syrians are reinforcing their missiles there, making a military operation more difficult." Dayan said he favored exhausting the diplomatic process and that the negotiations should continue to be mediated by the United States, "that is, far broader shoulders, with contacts with the Soviet Union or not, as they decide." He said that on one matter, that of the PLO, "we must leave ourselves absolute freedom of action."

Asked about optimistic reports to the effect that a solution was now being sought in the inter-Arab arena, Shamir first of all said he "could not confirm the remark about any special optimism," though Israel welcomed the continuation of the diplomatic efforts. Israel, he said, had its own objective to achieve in this matter, and it was this which would prevent a war. As for time limits, "Israel, as is known, has not set ultimatums--that by such-and-such a date we want an absolute answer--but we stressed the importance of the time factor. There can be no foot dragging. We are interested in achieving this objective which will allow us to implement our own goals. Therefore, we are stressing--without placing a limit on the time--that the time cannot be extended indefinitely, because in the meantime things are happening on the ground. There are war preparations in Syria, and it was to this that the prime minister was referring when he said 'if we are attacked'--because from what we see on the ground, that possibility also exists. One way or another, Israel is ready for any eventuality. It prefers the possibility of the political solution and is making very many efforts in that direction."

The participants were then asked what Israel's objectives and interests in Lebanon should be. Dayan said Israel should want the Syrians out of Lebanon, adding: "I reject the agreement on the red line made in 1976 by the Rabin government." Israel, he said, should not have agreed to a situation that legitimized Syrian military activity in northern Lebanon, north of the Al-Litani. Nonetheless, while even the previous situation was not a good one, "I do have an order of priorities: First of all, the missiles must be removed." Shamir said that Israel wanted first of all a "free and independent Lebanon," meaning that there be no Syrian or terrorist control of all or parts of that country. "This is the objective of our policy, and this is where we have an identify of interests with the majority of the Christian population in Lebanon." As for the immediate aims: "We must prevent the Syrians' progressing, creeping takeover of Lebanon, and we must strike relentlessly at the terrorists. This we shall do and we are doing."

Eban said that Israel must defend its northern settlements, and "this obligates us to support the Christians in the south and to adopt freedom of action against the terrorists. It obligates us to have freedom of aerial reconnaissance. It does not obligate us to expand our commitment to the Christians beyond these specific goals, or to say that it is comparable to the Jewish holocaust, or to say that we have an unlimited commitment."

TZIPORI BRIEFS KNESSET COMMITTEE ON PLO POSITION

TA201319 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 20 May 81 p 2

[Yehoshu'a Bitzur report]

[Text] Deputy Defense Minister MK Mordekhay Tzipori yesterday expressed his evaluation at the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee that the PLO is now trying to prevent an escalation in the situation regarding the missiles in Lebanon, fearing that it would be crushed in the big confrontation between Israel and Syria.

Therefore, a decline in the scope of terrorist activities along the northern border has been recently discerned.

Tzipori told the committee that the Syrians are continuing to reinforce their missile deployment in Lebanon. For the time being, they are only maintaining a defensive deployment but it would not be difficult to switch it to an offensive deployment.

According to Tzipori, the impression gathered is that the Syrians do not want a flare-up, although they are not deterred at the prospect of one. They also believe that an actual confrontation with Israel will strengthen their position in the Arab world and will extract them from their isolation. It seems that the Saudis do not bear much influence in determining Damascus' positions. Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad coordinates all his moves with Moscow. The Syrians have so far displayed a high degree of rigidity in all talks and contacts.

Tzipori added that sporadic shelling continued on the Chirstian positions and areas in northern Lebanon. The committee also learned that the Syrians have stopped using helicopters against the Christian positions. They are entrenching on top of the Sannin heights overlooking the Christian areas and are paving access roads to the mountain. In the meantime, the Syrians are continuing to transfer missiles and armored units to northern Lebanon to reinforce their deployment there. This deployment clearly shows that the Syrians are also preparing for the eventuality of war.

The committee also learned that units of the Soviet and U.S. fleets, which have been recently patrolling near the Lebanese and Israeli coasts, have left the area.

Mr Mikha Harish of the Alignment accused Prime Minister Menahem Begin of continuously undermining the consensus by means of procrastinating and evasive tricks not to agree to the Alignment's proposal to leave the Lebanese issue outside the elections campaign in the midst of a security and political state of emergency. He charged Begin with violating the tradition established by previous prime ministers and said that Begin's accusations about the opposition's disloyalty were utterly groundless. MK Harish expressed the fear that the people and the nation would be faced with additional faits accomplis that had not been consulted with the opposition.

Yosef Tzuri'el adds: The [illegible]ious types of terrorist activities in Judaea and Samaria have in the last 4 months [illegible]hed an unprecedented low since the Yom Kippur War.

It has been learned from security sources that less than 80 people have been arrested from January to April 1981 on the suspicion of being involved in hostile activities. The cases involving about 60 of them did not require legal proceedings or extended arrests and they were released after being warned. Concerning the others, it was made clear that they had not perpetrated any terrorist acts although they had been ready to undertake such missions had they been required to do so. Only four suspects were found to possess personal weapons and sabotage devices.

According to security elements, this situation stems from the policy currently carried out in the territories, namely, the blockage of the channels for smuggling weapons and explosives, preventive measures against youths suspected to have been recruited or about to be recruited by the terrorist organizations, as well as the adoption of drastic measures against those people suspected of being involved in terrorist activities.

CONFERENCE ON SOUTH AFRICA CONVENES IN PARIS

Nigerian Leader's Departure

AB191239 Lagos Domestic Service in English 1200 GMT 19 May 81

[Text] The vice president, Dr Alex Ekwueme, left Lagos this morning for France at the head of a Nigerian delegation to an international conference on sanctions against apartheid South Africa sponsored by the UN and the OAU.

Members of the delegation include two special advisers, Prof G. Odenigwe and Dr Odama. Others to join them are the minister of state in the Ministry of External affairs, Mr Patrick Bolokor; Nigeria's permanent representative at the United Nations, Mr Akporode Clark; and Nigeria's ambassador to France, Mr George Dove-Edwin.

Before returning home on Sunday, the vice president will pay a 2-day private visit to London. He was seen off at the Murtalla Muhammed Airport by the minister of health, Mr Daniel Ugwu. The conference ends next week.

Liberian Minister's Departure

AB210818 Monrovia Radio ELWA in English 0625 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] Foreign Minister G. Bacchus Matthews left Liberia yesterday for Paris, France, to attend a special international conference on sanctions against the South African Government in Pretoria. Minister Matthews is being accompanied by his special assistant, (Ocassey Kawa), and the deputy commissioner for maritime affairs, (George Arkum).

According to a release from the Foreign Ministry in Monrovia, the weeklong Paris conference is jointly sponsored by the antiapartheid group at the United Nations and the OAU. It is expected that Liberia's primary concern at the conference will be the address which [words indistinct] by an OAU research committee that ships flying Liberian flags were violating OAU resolutions prohibiting ties with South Africa and were unloading oil and other materials at South African ports.

Mandatory Sanctions Issue

AB210821 Lagos Domestic Service in English 0600 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] Nigeria has called for the nullification of the recent veto by France, Britain and the United States on the issues of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against apartheid South Africa. In addition, she has called for the promulgation of an international program of action that will bring the racist regime to its knees. The vice president, Dr Alex Ekwueme, made the call yesterday in Paris at the conference on sanctions against South Africa, jointly organized by the United Nations and the OAU.

He stated that the presence of distinguished participants at the conference is a demonstration that the tripartite veto has not succeeded in striking legal consensus on apartheid and said that Western bureaucracy was out of step with the vast opinion of mankind. Dr Ekwueme assured the participants that the call for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa was not a matter of venegance, but a call for decency.

Top representatives from about 100 countries, mostly the countries' foreign ministers, are attending the conference.

DJIBOUTI

USSR CIVIL AVIATION DELEGATION ARRIVES 17 MAY

LD200428 Djibouti Domestic Service in Somali 1645 GMT 19 May 81 EA

[Text] A delegation from the Soviet Ministry of Civil Aviation is currently in the country. The delegation, which is led by the deputy chief of the Foreign Relations Administration of the Ministry of Civil Aviation, Mr Mirzoyan, arrived in Djibouti on Sunday, 17 May. The Soviet delegation has been holding talks since yesterday with Djibouti leaders on the conclusion of civil aviation agreements between the two countries.

KENYA

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS CLASH WITH RIOT POLICE

LD191244 Kampala Domestic Service in English 0700 GMT 19 May 81 EA

[Text] In Nairobi, protesting students have clashed with riot police after Kenyan authorities closed Nairobi University yesterday.

The authorities decided on the closure after 1 week of student meetings and demonstrations in support of political and educational grievances. Students also said they started marching through the city after being ordered to leave the university. They were dispersed by police armed with batons. There were no immediate reports of injuries. Police in battledress toured the city in troop carriers and appealed to the students, through loudspeakers, to go home.

Yesterday, police fired into the air to disperse several hundred students gathered outside university hostels. Students said their main complaint was a proposal to close the university for 9 months of the year.

TANZANIA

STATEMENT ISSUED ON INDONESIAN MINISTER'S VISIT

BK191109 Jakarta OANA in English 0913 GMT 19 May 81

["Pool item"]

[Text] Dar es Salaam, 18 May (ANTARA/OANA)--Indonesian Foreign Minister Mochtar Kusumaatmadja and his Tanzanian counterpart Salim Ahmed Salim Saturday said that they were satisfied with developments in bilateral relations between the two countries. Speaking at a press conference the two agreed that the Indonesian foreign minister's visit to Tanzania has resulted in stronger bilateral relations. They also agreed to promote similar visits by leaders of the two countries to seek closer cooperation.

The two expressed concern over the growing tensions in the world and called for complete abolition of colonialism, racialism and any kinds of foreign domination and promotion of new international economic order.

They recited their expressed stand of helping freedom fighters in South AFrica, and regret that the three-year old resolution of the Security Council on Namibia has brought no tangible result toward its independence. Namibia has so far been under occupation of the racialist South Africa.

Kusumaatmadja told his Tanzanian counterpart about latest situation in Southeast Asia. He said he was convinced that Kampuchean issue could be settled by the United Nations and the non-aligned principles.

The joint statement also mentioned about the growing crisis in the Middle East especially in Lebanon. The two accused Israel of violating the sovereignty of Lebanon, and denying the rights of the Palestinian people of a free country.

CHAD

KAMOUGUE CRITICIZES LIBYAN SUBVERSION IN CHAD

AB201318 Paris AFP in French 1155 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] Ndjamena, 20 May (AFP)--The vice president of the Chadian Transitional National Union Government, Lt Col Wadal Abdelhader Kamougue, has strongly criticized the subversive activities of Libya inside Chad, and he has called for the withdrawal of the Libyan troops and their replacement by an African peace keeping force.

Lieutenant Colonel Kamougue, who was recently addressing about 200 Chadian cadres currently holding a seminar in Ndjamena, believes that Libyan assistance is not devoid of selfish motives; rather it contributes to the establishment of Libya's military and political position in Chad. He added that the assistance involves subversive activites marked by the stirring up of clashes among Chadians.

The vice president, who was struck with a momentary pain, did not finish his speech. The end was read by the minister of national education, Mr Ali Pamdegue.

For their part, the cadres attending the Ndjamena seminar also demanded the withdrawal of Libyan troops from Chad, the suppression of factions and the setting up of an integrated army.

In the political sphere, they called for the establishment of a unitarian and decentralized state in Chad, possibly with administrative autonomy for the regions.

The seminar, which is scheduled to continue for a few more days, is attended by delegates from the 14 divisions, representatives of Chadian students abroad and trade union delegates, in addition to cadres from all over the country.

FOUR FROLINAT FACTIONS MERGE IN NATIONAL COUNCIL

AB210936 Paris AFP in French 0821 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] Ndjamena, 21 May (AFP)--Four factions of the Frolinat have merged ino a single movement following a meeting of representatives of those factions held recently in Ndjamena, it has been learned from the Chadian capital.

The four factions are the Revolutionary Democratic Council (CDR), the Popular Armed Forces (FAP) the Western Armed Forces (FAO) and the First Army.

These four factions have thus decided to come together under one command, the National Council for the Revolution (CNR), and to put together their civil properties.

The new organ created from Frolinat proposes to work for the handing over of all administrative powers in the regions formerly controlled by the dissolved factions to the Transitional National Union Government (GUNT), and to fight against any divisive tendencies by former factions.

IVORY COAST

ALGERIAN FOREIGN MINISTER MEETS WITH PRESIDENT

LD181523 Algiers EL MOUDJAHID in French 14 May 81 p 1

[APS special correspondent dispatch: "Mr Ben Yahia received by President Houphouet-Boigny"]

[Text] Yamoussoukro--On his official visit to the Ivory Coast Foreign Minister Mohamed Benyahia was received for a 2-hour meeting on Wednesday in Yamoussoukro by Ivory Coast chief of state President Houphouet-Boigny.

The talks were attended, on the Algerian side, by Mohamed Abada, the foreign ministry Africa desk chief; and Mohamed Aberkane, Algerian ambassador in Abiduan; and, on the Ivory Coast side, by Simeon Ake, foreign minister; Adonit Manouan, the Foreign Ministry director of political affairs; and Youssouf Kone, the Ivory Coast ambassador in Algiers.

Following the talks Mr Mohamed Benyahia made a statement to the press in which he stressed, among other things, that the agreements signed today in Yamoussoukro "create institutional structures for cooperation between Algeria and the Ivory Coast.

"The agreements," he added, "embrace all fields, whether economic, cultural, scientific or others. No aspect was forgotten," he explained.

He also described his talks with President Houphouet-Boigny as "a rewarding conversation."

Mr Benyahia and the delegation accompanying him were the guests at a dinner given by President Houphouet-Boigny.

NIGERIA

LAGOS ANNOUNCES SHAGARI TO GO TO NDJAMENA 21 MAY

AB201534 Lagos Domestic Service in English 1500 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] President Shehu Shagari is to attend a special meeting on Chad tomorrow in Ndjamena, that country's capital. The meeting, will be presided over by the current chairman of the Organization of African Unity, OAU, President Siaka Stevens of Sierra Leone, who is expected in Lagos later this afternoon. He will join President Shagari in the Chadian capital tomorrow. The two presidents will return to Lagos the same day.

A Radio Nigeria State House correspondent says the Libyan president, Col Mu'Ammar al-Qadhdhafi, is also expected in Ndjamena for the meeting. Among the major issues to be discussed by the African leaders are the complete withdrawal of Libyan troops from Chad and the deployment of an African peacekeeping force under the auspices of the OAU. Proposals for assistance by African countries in the reconstruction and rehabilitation programs of Chad will also be examined.

OFFICIALS, PRESS REACT TO INCIDENT WITH CAMEROON

Support for Military Action

AB202040 Lagos International Service in English 1630 GMT 20 May 81

[From the press review]

[Text] The killing of five Nigerian soldiers by Cameroonian troops is given preeminent treatment by nearly all Nigerian newspapers. According to the papers, the soldiers were undertaking routine patrol duties when a Cameroonian patrol team coming from the opposite direction opened fire on them. The papers also understand that three other Nigerian soldiers were wounded in the incident.

Talking with THE PUNCH later, the external affairs minister, Prof Ishaya Audu, explained that it is the statutory duty of the Nigerian Armed Forces personnel to mark frequent patrol of the Akai-Ate River in protection of Nigeria's border, while their Cameroonian counterparts guard their own side of the border.

Minister Audu contends, the paper adds, that the cold murder is a climax of the regular harassment of Nigerians living in the border, which, according to him, has culminated into incursions by the Cameroonians into Nigerian villages.

The paper, however, reports that the maritime border in the Cross River State had constituted the most contentious problem. It adds that Nigeria had persistently sought to arrive at an amicable solution, which was climaxed by President Shehu Shagari's visit to the Cameroon early this year.

The DAILY TIMES and THE PUNCH continue in other columns that the Federal Government has demanded an unqualified apology from the Cameroon. In addition, the papers say, Nigeria wants reparation and proper punishment for the murderers, as well as full compensation to the bereaved Nigerian families.

As the TIMES specifically puts it, Prof Ishaya Audu warns that in the event of intransigence on the part of the Cameroonian authorities, the Federal Government reserves the right to take whatever action it considers appropriate to protect the lives and property of her citizens.

THE PUNCH, the NEW NIGERIAN, and the TRIBUNE learn that the House of Representatives and the Unity Party of Nigeria support any tough action that would be taken by the Federal Government. They both want Nigeria to take punitive military action against the Cameroon to serve as a deterrent to future acts of aggression from any quarter.

No Cameroon Statement Yet

AB210724 Lagos Domestic Service in English 0600 GMT 21 May 81

[Text] The Cameroonian Embassy in Lagos says it is still awaiting a statement from its home government on the apology demanded by the Federal Government over the killing of five Nigerian soldiers. An official of the embassy told our Radio Nigeria news correspondent yesterday that the feeling of Nigeria over the incident had been communicated to the home government.

Meanwhile, the Nigerian Labor Congress has described the killings as barbaric and an unfriendly act. The congress also appealed to all Nigerians, irrespective of political affiliation, to support the government in its bid to protect the [word indistinct] integrity of the nation.

Caution Advised

AB210921 Lagos International Service in English 0830 GMT 21 May 81

[Press review]

[Text] The recent killing of five Nigerian soldiers as well as the wounding of three by Cameroonian troops attracts comment from the NIGERIAN TRIBUNE, the STATESMAN, and the NEW NIGERIAN. All the papers dondemn the aggression in very strong terms and remark that similar atrocities have been perpetrated by that country on village farmers and fishermen.

The NIGERIAN TRIBUNE says the Federal Government must react to this immediately to serve as a deterrent to other infiltrators. It argues that Nigeria could no longer afford to fold her hands while her citizens and property are being destroyed.

But in its comment, the NEW NIGERIAN calls on the Federal Government to exercise caution on the matter and conceding that Nigeria has been provoked to the extreme, the paper thinks that issues could still be sorted out diplomatically without resorting to war. The NEW NIGERIAN contends that Nigeria should not provide a fertile ground for foreign intervention.

And the NIGERIAN STATESMAN advises Cameroon to comply with the conditions spelled out by the Federal Government. It says in the absence of this Nigeria must be prepared to flex her muscles since, according to it, it is only through this that she can prove to the world that she could also (?bite as hard) as she can bark.

NEW NIGERIAN REPORTS 20 DEATHS IN BORNO CLASHES

AB200950 Lagos International Service in English 0830 GMT 20 May 81

[Press review]

[Excerpt] The NEW NIGERIAN expresses concern over reports of political intolerance in Borno State where, according to it, about 20 persons have been reported dead during clashes between followers of the National Party of Nigeria and the Great Nigeria People's Party. The paper calls on leaders of thought in the state to reconvene another meeting aimed at bringing permanent peace to the state.

SIERRA LEONE

STEVENS LEAVES TO ATTEND NDJAMENA SUMMIT

AB202101 Freetown Domestic Service in English 2000 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] President Siaka Stevens, who is current chairman of the OAU, left today on a peace mission to Ndjamena, Chad. At a swearing-in ceremony at (Longe) International Airport, Acting President S.I. Koroma praised the efforts of Dr Stevens in his search for peace in Chad. The acting president said that the peace meeting is very vital and a course in the right direction to end the loss of human life in that country. He emphasized that the president will seek all the solution to bring about peace and wished him success in his role as mediator.

After the departure of the president, First Vice President S. I. Koroma was sworn in as acting president, while Attorney General A. B. Kamara took the oath of office as second vice president. [as heard]

TOGO

LOME ANNOUNCES REORGANIZATION OF CABINET

AB210808 Lome Domestic Service in French 0615 GMT 21 May 81

[Excerpt] The Togolese Government was slightly reshuffled yesterday by the head of state, Gen Gnassingbe Eyadema. On the one hand, three ministers have left the cabinet to make room for four new personalities. On the other hand, Mrs Massan Dagadi, secretary of state, has been promoted to the post of minister delegated to the presidency of the republic in charge of relations with Parliament.

(?Those affected by the reshuffle) are, Mr Voule Frititi of the Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports, Mr Samon Kortho of the Ministry of Rural Management and Vigniko Amedegnato of the Ministry of First and Second Degree Education. The new Cabinet members are, Mr Koffi Sama of the Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports, Mr Chatikpi Ouro Bangana of the Ministry of Rural Management, and Mr Akoussou Amouzou of the Ministry of First and Second Degree Education. Mr Gbegnon Amegbch, former secretary general of information has been given the portfolio of the Ministry of Information and Posts and Telecommunications.

Apart from these new appointments, the other members of government have retained their posts. The Cabinet will be headed by Gen Gnassingbe Eyadema, president of the republic and minister of defense.

ANGOLA

DECREE ESTABLISHES NATIONAL IRON COMPANY

AB151435 Luanda Domestic Service in French 1100 GMT 15 May 81

[Text] A communique from the Central Committee [words indistinct] over the payment of taxes under the special tax deduction for petroleum enterprises and provides for all [word indistinct] measures. The decree published by the (?journal) of the republic and which takes immediate effect also concerns all enterprises which carry out prospecting, research, production and marketing of hydrocarbon products in Angola.

Another decree of the Council of Ministers and signed by the president of the republic also establishes the national iron company, named Ferangol, [word indistinct] an economic unit. The document added that Ferangol headquarters will be in Luanda; its main objectives are to explore, treat and market iron and manganese mineral resources as well as to carry out research on other mineral resources. The same decree also defines (?the statute) of Ferangol [passage indistinct].

SOUTH AFRICA

RESPONSE TO U.S. INITIATIVE ON NAMIBIA CONVEYED

LD201210 Johannesburg International Service in English 1100 GMT 20 May 81

[Text] South Africa's answer to the new U.S. initiative on the South-West Africa question has been conveyed to the Reagan Administration. Radio South Africa's political correspondent reports that the official response was sent to Washington late last night and that indications in diplomatic circles are that South Africa has generally given a positive answer. He says the South African position was probably finalized at yesterday's Cabinet meeting in Pretoria.

Our political correspondent adds that because of the extremely delicate nature of the matters dealt with in the response it is expected that details will only be made known after the United States has studied the response or possibly commented on it. It is also expected that South Africa's answer will play an important role in tomorrow's talks in New York among members of the Western five contact group.

Last week when the South African foreign minister, Mr. Roelof Botha, returned from his talks in Washington with his counterpart, Gen Alexander Haig, he said that Resolution 435 of the United Nations was the focal point of the talks. It is generally accepted that the new proposals on South-West Africa include changes to Resolution 435 and also affect the proposed role of UN troops in the independence process.

ZIMBABWE

FREEDOM FIGHTERS INTEGRATED INTO NATIONAL ARMY

LD211036 Blantyre Domestic Service in English 1600 GMT 20 May 81 EA

[Excerpt] In Zimbabwe all former freedom fighters are now reported to have been disarmed and are being integrated in the national army. Informed sources in Salisbury said the highly sensitive disarmament operation ended yesterday when men of the minister without portfolio, Mr Joshua Nkomo's Zimbabwe People's Revolutionary Army handed over the last of their weapons at Gwaai River in western Zimbabwe. The government announced at the weekend that the last armed stronghold of the Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army, the wartime force of Prime Minister Mr Robert Mugabe, had been disarmed last Friday.